

# American Historical Review

## PRODUCTIVITY OF DOCTORS OF PHILOSOPHY IN HISTORY

DURING the past year the American Historical Association launched a "drive" for an endowment of a million dollars to further the main purpose of its existence—the promotion of historical research. A committee<sup>1</sup> was appointed to draw up a Proposed Programme for Research and Publication, that there might be a wise expenditure of the income derived from the prospective endowment. The committee felt that the Association ought to assume a more positive leadership than heretofore in stimulating and guiding research and in publishing the results. It was also agreed that the cause of historiography would be greatly advanced if more research papers found their way into print and if potential authors felt a reasonable certainty that the results of their labors, if worth while, would be printed.

These problems led the committee to undertake an inquiry, first to discover why there is not more productive research on the part of the holders of Ph.D. degrees in history, and secondly what obstacles hinder the publication of research, contemplated, in process, or completed. Accordingly a questionnaire<sup>2</sup> was sent to some five hundred

<sup>1</sup> The members of the committee are Professors Dana C. Munro of Princeton, Carlton J. H. Hayes of Columbia, Arthur M. Schlesinger of Harvard, William K. Boyd of Duke, and Marcus W. Jernegan of Chicago.

<sup>2</sup> *Questionnaire for Doctors of Philosophy.*

Dear Sir:

The Committee on Preparing a Programme for Research and Publication of the American Historical Association wishes to obtain information on the question "Why graduate work in history leads to so little productive research on the part of holders of Ph.D. degrees". You will confer a great favor by replying to the enclosed questionnaire (omitting your signature if you wish) giving your frank and full opinion on the question asked. Please send replies as quickly as possible, to Professor M. W. Jernegan, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

1. What in your opinion is the obligation or duty of a doctor of philosophy in history to teaching on the one hand and research on the other?
2. What is the attitude of the president of the institution where you now hold a position, toward research as compared with teaching?

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXIII.—I. (1)

Ph.D.'s in history. About 260 replies were received, representing a great variety of institutions and professors. The questions were based on the assumption that the Ph.D. degree in history not only signified that the holder was capable of independent research, but that he was granted the degree with a hope, at least, that he would become a productive scholar. The answers received,<sup>3</sup> with other evidence, point to the conclusion that less than twenty-five per cent. of the doctors of philosophy in history are consistent producers.<sup>4</sup> This may or may not be a fair average. It would be interesting to know whether there are more productive Ph.D.'s in English, economics, or mathematics, for example.<sup>5</sup> Some have the impression that the holders of the Ph.D. degree in the physical sciences are more productive than those in history. It is asserted that relatively few of the German Ph.D.'s in history are productive scholars. Thus it is possible that the percentage given for history is not unreasonably low in comparison with other subjects. However, this would not be a reason against increasing the number of productive scholars in this field.

3. Is the desire to do research work generally lacking, and if so, for what reasons?

4. Is the failure to "produce" due to factors that prevent or greatly hinder the desire from being carried out? *e.g.*: *a.* Teaching load, number of hours and different courses per week; *b.* Relation of salary to cost of and time needed for research; as affected by outside work, pleasure, standard of living.

5. Does your college library, or any other depository of historical material in your immediate vicinity, contain sufficient materials for a line of research that could be pursued with profit?

6. Is it true that research is hindered or delayed because of the belief that only a large and important subject is worth undertaking?

7. Is it true that the difficulties of defraying the cost of publication, or finding a suitable medium, are serious influences which hinder research?

8. Would you be likely to produce a particular piece of work if you were assured of a definite grant sufficient to cover part of the expenses of research and publication?

9. Why do so many students make a substantial start in graduate work but fail to take the final degree?

10. Will you add any other reason that you think of that will help to explain why there is no more productive research on the part of holders of Ph.D. degrees?

<sup>3</sup> A preliminary report was made by the writer at the last December meeting of the American Historical Association, at Rochester. Another report, based mainly on the answers to the first four questions, was made at the meeting of the Association of American Colleges held in Chicago, and was printed in its *Bulletin* for April, 1927. The writer also published an article, "The Colleges and Historical Research", designed to throw light on the problem of research in the smaller colleges (question 5), in the *Historical Outlook* for March, 1927.

<sup>4</sup> This estimate is of course tentative.

<sup>5</sup> "I am not certain that our proportion of 'routine men' as compared with our leaders is larger than the proportion in any other profession."

For an understanding of this problem it is desirable to consider briefly the history of the doctor's degree in America.<sup>6</sup> About 1870 there began a great expansion of education. The leaders in the movement were anxious to elevate all professional education by giving a new significance to the already existing degrees in law, medicine, and theology; but outside of these there was a group of other subjects, later included under the term "Arts and Sciences", and for these the degree of "doctor" suggested itself. In England, and in most Continental countries, it denoted a scholar of mature years, who had made his name by important contributions to learning, and who might or might not be occupied with teaching. In Germany it meant a young man who had just completed his professional studies, had shown some capacity for original work, and would, presumably, become a professional teacher. The German usage was adopted in this country, and the degree was conferred, as was bound to happen in a democratic community, in accordance with the quality of the candidate and the resources of the granting institutions. The stronger of them set their requirements as high as they dared. The weaker ones imitated their forms, but could not then, and, it may be remarked, do not now, maintain their standards. A period of degradation followed which brought the Ph.D. degree into a not wholly undeserved contempt. Doctors *in absentia* and doctors by correspondence could not command respect, and certainly could not be expected to advance the cause of sound learning. We are now in a period of standardization, with its inevitable result: the elimination of the worst and the cramping of the best. The doctor's degree, as we accepted it from Germany, was never intended to guarantee the continuous productivity of all those upon whom the degree was conferred. It was hoped, however, that "out of the mass of rather highly standardized mediocrity" a reasonable number of individuals would rise to high professional distinction.

It is clear, from this brief survey, that one hindrance to research is due to the historical origin and purpose of the degree, and to the character of the candidates. Universities have not essentially changed the theory of the degree from the standpoint of future production.<sup>7</sup> If the major universities would enter into an agreement

<sup>6</sup> The following historical survey is based on a letter from Professor Ephraim Emerton of Harvard: a history "through the whole of which I have lived and a part of which I was."

<sup>7</sup> Even now the requirements for the degree as set forth by the major universities do not stipulate or indicate the obligation, or even the desirability, of productivity after the degree has been conferred.

"Any person on whom the University [Harvard] confers the degree of Doctor of Philosophy is thereby recognized as qualified to give instruction to candidates for this degree in the subject in which he has taken the degree, and to advance knowledge in that subject by his own investigation."

to confer the degree only on those who are reasonably certain to produce, this part of the general problem would solve itself. As will appear later, however, such an agreement is unlikely; first because of a conflict of opinion on the proper relation between teaching and research; and secondly because of the difficulty of determining beforehand what candidates are likely to be productive. As Professor Haskins says, "Many people have to be exposed to training for research in order that the disease may take thoroughly with a few! This is a part of the waste of nature".<sup>8</sup> The problem then, under present conditions, is not that of attempting the impossible—striving to make every Ph.D. a productive scholar—but rather that of removing obstacles which now hinder those who desire, and have the ability, to produce worth-while pieces of research.<sup>9</sup>

Since it is generally agreed that Ph.D.'s have numerous duties, that of research and publication being only one, the question arises as to the relation between research and other obligations, particularly that of teaching.<sup>10</sup> The answers to this first question show that it is considered as a major problem. The opinion is almost unanimous that the main duty of a Ph.D. is to teach, especially if located in a small college where he was appointed to his position mainly for this purpose.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, it is agreed that, both because it would tend to make them better teachers and because there is some obligation to produce, doctors of philosophy in history who have the ability ought to make some effort to extend the bounds of human knowledge, particularly in the case of those with natural inclination

<sup>8</sup> Another correspondent remarks: "But you cannot make a factory turn out the products of a seminary and not all seeds will germinate into fruitful plants. We may expect a process of the survival of the fittest only, under any conditions. And the fittest are not multitudinous."

<sup>9</sup> This is well stated by Professor Cheyney: "I imagine that the fact of the matter is, that the group of qualities that enable a man to become a 'productive scholar', like the group of qualities that enable a man to become rich, or to become a good college president, are not often found under one hat. When they are, it is a pity that 4(a), 4(b), 7, and the absence of 8 should make the way of the scholar so hard and his output so small as they are, under present American university conditions. . . . It is not necessary that all teachers and students of history should be writers. Nor are the latter necessarily any better than the former. But for the purpose of this inquiry, I suppose the latter are the sheep and the former the goats. The great desideratum is therefore to separate the sheep from the goats and give the sheep better pasture."

<sup>10</sup> Question 1 of the questionnaire.

<sup>11</sup> "I should make a distinction between a college and a university. By accepting a place in a small college, where the funds are short, the doctor of philosophy thereby obligates himself, it seems to me, to devote most of his time and energy to teaching." See note 13.



toward such work.<sup>12</sup> The relative amount of time given to research depends on the institution. Many believe that the capable professors in the larger universities should devote nearly all of their time to research. In the smaller universities and colleges it is suggested that the percentage should be twenty-five per cent. or more.<sup>13</sup> A few believe that a large amount of time given to research might make some professors ineffective as teachers;<sup>14</sup> that perhaps as vigorous a mental life may be stimulated in professor and student by wide reading and study, as by research.<sup>15</sup> In general, then, by reason of the present organization, ideals, and methods of American colleges, teaching is looked upon as the primary obligation of a Ph.D. in history. But a majority of the replies indicate that there is a desire to have research looked upon as more of an obligation than is the case at present. We may conclude then that the prevailing theory of education is a major limitation on research. This becomes even more apparent in the answers to the second question.

An analysis of these answers<sup>16</sup> reveals the belief that at least fifty per cent. of the presidents of colleges represented are hostile, or so lukewarm that little real encouragement is given to professors who wish to carry on research. Either they are told that research is not expected or wanted; or if a professor does produce, no notice is taken of his work, in terms of larger salary and promotion, as com-

<sup>12</sup> "The duty of any individual will depend upon his peculiar temperament, *i.e.*, his consciousness of ability as a teacher or as a scholar."

<sup>13</sup> "For instruction of freshmen and sophomores, teaching should take 80 per cent. and research 20 per cent. of the time. For instruction of upper classmen the proportion should be 65 per cent. for teaching and 35 per cent. for research. The conflict between research and teaching does not seem to me to arise in instruction of graduate students."

<sup>14</sup> "What worries me much more than the dearth of research is the all too current evaluation of a man's worth by his actual production rather than by his actual effectiveness in the class-room, and the partial perversion of undergraduate teaching by confiding the job to men whose interests lie elsewhere, and who consider it as an unpleasant interruption to the life of scholarship. Can we not differentiate more sharply than we have hitherto done between the graduate and the undergraduate teacher?"

<sup>15</sup> This is Dr. Jameson's view: "It is true that most teachers of history can not keep themselves thoroughly alive if they do nothing else than to teach their classes and make necessary preparations. But many excellent scholars and cultivated persons keep themselves thoroughly alive by reading—the reading of things that they don't positively have to read in order to confront their classes—without proceeding to print results of reading. That may answer all purposes, *provided* the man has once learned how to conduct a prolonged investigation and write a book, and could do it well if he chose."

<sup>16</sup> It should be noted that the testimony is not from the presidents themselves but from the professors. Some of the replies appear to place the blame for lack of research on the president because that is the easiest method of excusing non-production.

pared with the recognition given to teaching or to administrative work. The phrases used by professors to describe the attitude of their president are interesting, such as: "He has no conception of research." "He is opposed to research during the academic year." "He does not promote on the basis of research." "He gives no encouragement." "It is not wise to answer the question", says one professor. "He would like to be regarded as favorable", says another. "Lukewarm", says another, "thinks my contribution to life much greater if I contribute directly through teaching or committee work."

Of the fifty per cent. of college presidents asserted to be favorable or sympathetic to research, there are few, according to the professors, who do not emphasize teaching as the first duty, and few apparently who make a practice of rewarding research in terms of promotion or salary on the same basis as they do teaching.<sup>17</sup> If the president of the college is lukewarm or hostile, then one important incentive to research is lost. The professor feels that he must protect himself by concentrating on teaching. The only other possibility would be for him to continue to produce on the theory that some other president would recognize his work and call him to a better position. It is discouraging to learn that so many college presidents are out of harmony with the most significant development of modern times—that is, the widespread spirit of research.

The purpose of the third question was to discover what proportion of Ph.D.'s in history had a consuming desire to produce; how

<sup>17</sup> "My president, like other presidents, renders lip-service to research but immediately forgets this interest when the teaching schedule is handed out, and only remembers it when he is hiring a man whom he can herald to the local community as a great scholar."

"Our teachers are employed first of all for their services as teachers. If they can do research in addition to their regular teaching some recognition is given them in words but not in salary nor professional rank."

"A mildly, but not aggressively, friendly attitude toward research, with emphasis, perhaps, chiefly upon its contributions to the tone and prestige of the institution. In the recent past these qualifications seem to have been stressed in the following order: (a) teaching ability; (b) public appeal (particularly, perhaps, in the case of historians, who have been regarded as publicists); and (c) productive scholarship."

A few replies were received showing a more favorable attitude toward research. From a Ph.D. in history who is now president of a college: "Some doctors of philosophy in history could not possibly teach and others, who have fairly earned the degree, ought not to try to do any writing. I do not believe there is any abstract answer to this question. I believe that most people teach a great deal better if they have some research project afoot. This brings to them stimulation of interest; it enlarges their fund of illustration and in other ways improves their teaching. I feel that research should be encouraged (where men are competent for it) by reasonable teaching hours, by sabbatical years, and by salaries which will enable people to work at scholarly tasks during the summer." See note 44.

far there was a vital interest in research. Generally speaking there are two types of faculty men: the teacher and the "researcher". A few combine ability in both lines in about equal degree, but the first group is in the great majority. As will appear later, the universities have allowed large numbers of candidates to gain the degree whose sole aim was to use it to get a "job", for teaching positions in many colleges can not be had without a doctor's degree. A large proportion of this group never had any intention of carrying on research after obtaining their degree, perhaps because of a realization of their own limitations, or lack of natural interest, or a belief that their usefulness lies in teaching.<sup>18</sup> Sometimes a Ph.D. has an "inferiority complex". Then he puts on "protective coloring" as rapidly as possible, for his own safety and peace of mind and for its effect on his fellow-workers, superior officers, or the president. "The business of a teacher is to teach."<sup>19</sup>

Among those that have a desire there are three main groups. In the first are those who have a purely theoretical interest,<sup>20</sup> and perhaps announce from time to time that they are "collecting material", but never actually produce. Obstacles to research are allowed to interfere with their desires. In some cases these obstacles are trivial and might be surmounted by moderate self-sacrifices.<sup>21</sup>

A second group has the desire more strongly developed, and many accomplish something—one piece of work perhaps besides

<sup>18</sup> "Why then, you ask, did I presume to waste the time and the energies of a university graduate school in working for a Ph.D. degree? My answer is that I wanted to do college or university teaching; the possession of such a degree is practically necessary in order to get any good appointment in such institutions. . . . For example, I was offered a position at . . . before I had finished my dissertation and secured my degree, but it was assumed and the appointment was virtually on the condition that I would get the degree. That is the whole story, and I am confident that there are dozens of doctors of philosophy who, like myself, worked for a Ph.D. degree merely to gain a necessary qualification for college or university teaching."

<sup>19</sup> "This type of man is primarily a *critic* and a *teacher* rather than a *productive scholar*. If allowed to follow his own bent, he becomes a master of all the literature in his field and is always abreast of the times. He knows books, is broad and has a well-developed personality—in short, is a splendid *teacher*—writing is exceedingly painful to him; he always goes about *worried* because he has not produced and is consequently unable to pursue his natural instincts to read broadly. He neither reads broadly nor produces, but dries up and frequently salvages the wreckage of his personality by mastering some side line or avocation."

<sup>20</sup> "When they begin to talk they talk about research but always find a good excuse for not doing it."

"It is good form to profess a desire to do research work, even when no desire exists."

<sup>21</sup> "The most fruitful source of lack of research work is inertia and the unwillingness on the part of the teacher to pay the price in labor and time necessary to complete a given research task."

their thesis; a few miscellaneous articles mostly popular or semi-popular, and perhaps one scientific article. This usually occurs during the first few years after graduation.<sup>22</sup> Then the desire grows cold and this group also joins the seventy-five per cent. who are candidates for "spade work". There may be one more "flare-up", due to some particular cause or motive—a threat of dismissal; a heart-to-heart talk with the head of the department or the president, in which the victim is told to "produce" or take the consequences. If excommunication is not resorted to, then the president has a good excuse to suggest that no advance in salary or promotion can be expected. Incited by this Sword of Damocles, and perhaps by a tearful and pleading or ambitious wife, an article or even a book—"under way for twenty years"—flashes forth, much to the surprise and mystification of the profession; Rip Van Winkle awakes and he is back again in the first flush of youthful desires for production. Desires stimulated by such drastic means are usually short-lived. The urge to research was not the result of inward desire, of a passion for production,<sup>23</sup> but imposed from without by some higher power. Still, production stimulated by such methods is perhaps better than none at all.

The third group, the twenty-five per cent., desire to produce so strongly that they carry on research consistently and publish it, often in spite of the most formidable obstacles and discouraging conditions. Nothing can stop them; the faculty, president, and trustees may be against them, and health, family, and perhaps position may be sacrificed, but they nevertheless will produce.<sup>24</sup> An English

<sup>22</sup> "The story is pathetic and constantly repeated. At the university the atmosphere stimulated them to all sorts of ambitions and they leave with great desires and expectations. The first year out is full of adjustments but the ambition is still there. Gradually the pressure of college duties wears them down and after four or five years the research idea is given up as hopeless."

<sup>23</sup> "The desire to do research work for its own sake is generally lacking, in the main because the doctorate is now received by many who have no real passion for research."

<sup>24</sup> "The qualities that enable a man to obtain knowledge, acquire the training and perform the specific piece of research work connected with the degree are not unusual. Many young men and women have the industry and intelligence called for by the requirements for the Ph.D. But few have these further qualities that lead a man to go on, stick at the subject, overcome obstacles, endure delays, avoid submergence in other duties, and, above all, to retain the enthusiasm for his subject that alone can produce tangible results, in the way of finished historical writing."

Professor J. H. Robinson writes that: "After all there are very few who are impelled by so persistent a curiosity as to make head against the manifold immediate demands of life. Patient seeking and, above all, the thoughtfulness which gives form and value to its findings, require a great deal more time than one cumbered with man's usual obligations and distractions can hope to enjoy. Those who go on

scholar has said: "Those who write, write, and those who don't, don't." Somewhat more than half of the replies received declare that Ph.D.'s in history have a desire to produce. But it is not possible to determine from the evidence the percentage of the first two groups.

The answers to the fourth question seem to indicate that a few in the first group and perhaps a considerable number in the second would produce if certain obstacles were removed. It is almost universally conceded that much of the failure to produce is due to factors which prevent or greatly hinder the desire from being carried out. These are often so overwhelming that some of the twenty-five per cent. of consistent producers would not survive the hostile environment by which many Ph.D.'s are surrounded. The heart-rending replies complaining of excessive teaching schedules, the number of different courses, and the starvation salaries, in relation to the time needed and the cost of research, make it plain that over wide areas the conditions favoring research are extremely unfavorable.

After teaching three or four hours a day—not a few have schedules of sixteen hours a week or more—besides attending to numerous other duties, consultations, committees—perhaps several hours of committee-work in one day—and other similar duties, when the day's work is done the time left is very short. "There isn't enough spunk to give the urge, not a sufficient spark to give the needful ignition." The man has "new courses" to work out—the fate of the average young instructor for several years. He must teach subjects with which he has little acquaintance.<sup>25</sup> A professor who is the leader in his field, located in one of the largest universities in the country, declares that the chief deterrent is the necessity of preparing for and doing so much teaching for so long a period of time, nine months as against seven months at most "in all other civilized countries". This teaching usually yields materials suitable for textbooks rather than for writing that "enlarges knowledge or understanding".

thinking and questioning, in spite of all the odds, rarely picture themselves as engaged in 'research'. Veblen engages in one 'inquiry' after another . . . and this is a good word of his. For honest curiosity is the firmest basis for discovery. 'Research' smacks of obligation or of ulterior aims rather than of persistent wonder."

<sup>25</sup> "One very important consideration in all cases is that of time. No one can teach more than five or six hours a week and have a fresh mind and sufficient time for reflection to be a useful productive scholar. The Old World discovered that fact many centuries ago. It behooves us to make it clear to the New World that humanity is very much the same everywhere, and that unless our teaching and administrative programmes are lightened, we can not be productive in any real sense of the word."

Low salaries compel outside activities, extensive lecturing, extra courses, summer courses, and innumerable other activities and industries designed to bring in the cash needed to keep up a suitable standard of living, pay the rent or "union labor prices to plumbers, carpenters, glaziers and the like, chiefly for the consumption of gasoline".

Then there are various forms of "service" demanded "for the good of the university" ranging from "talks" before societies, clubs, Rotaries, and Chambers of Commerce, to the judging of debates and foot-races. The inability to say "No" is an important reason for failure to produce.<sup>26</sup> Another form of service is connected with the problems of administration. A capable research man is often seized upon by the president or dean and is made to think that his opportunity for advancement is better through such work, and this is often the truth. This amounts to discrimination against research, though not perhaps consciously so. Administrative officers naturally pick as able men as they can, and if such a man happens to be a good research man, the fact is ignored.<sup>27</sup>

The description given of the resources of small college libraries where perhaps two-thirds of the Ph.D.'s work is what one would expect. The answers show that few libraries have much research material; that where present, it is either scattered over a large field of history or is confined to local history. Where the material is relatively large, it lies along one or two particular lines.<sup>28</sup> Thus trips to other libraries and depositories are necessary. The situation is very different from that which exists in the large university libraries. Those located in large cities are often supplemented by a dozen other libraries. Thus, much of the research accomplished must be done elsewhere than in the college library or immediate vicinity. But such research requires travel, living away from home, with the additional expense involved. In many cases this means travelling hundreds of miles for even state history, a thousand or more for national,

<sup>26</sup> "This sort of extra work is called *Service*, and is highly approved by almost all administrations. The notion that research, undertaken alone in the quiet of one's study, can be just as real *Service*, usually does not receive recognition until the student's task is finished and published, thereby acquiring a certain advertising value."

<sup>27</sup> "Another has gotten into a University deanship, and thus has sold himself to the devil of administration, as somebody recently put it."

<sup>28</sup> "The college library does not contain sufficient materials for profitable historical research; the local Masonic library has some, but most material available would necessarily require a considerable amount of time and money, both of which are lacking."



and trips abroad for English and other European history.<sup>29</sup> The conditions of research in history are so different from those of the physical sciences, for example, that there is no comparison. This topic is more fully discussed in connection with the answers to the sixth question.

On the other hand many who complain so emphatically of the lack of material, and offer this as an excuse for non-production, seem to be quite unaware of the nature and amount of material in the state and local archives, and in private hands. This is partly due to the fact that the Ph.D. may have been trained in European or English history, and is entirely unacquainted with the sources of American history or the nature of the materials available in his own locality. Or he may have been trained in colonial history and find himself in a North Dakota college. In either case he is convinced that he is "remote" from the materials necessary for research.<sup>30</sup>

The answers to the sixth question are closely related to that propounded as the fifth. No doubt the lack of knowledge or appreciation of local material leads many to think only in terms of large subjects—those of a national or international character; or only about fields of research in which they were originally trained; or about fields in which they are particularly interested. It is not appreciated by many that a large synthesis of history requires hundreds of smaller pieces of work. Published programmes of research, outlining a dozen or more large fields, with suggestions covering sections and states, periods, topics, men, and institutions, in political, economic, religious, and social history, would be a great help for the isolated worker. The average professor in a small college does not realize what topics need investigation, how they might fit into a larger whole, and what material for them is available in his own locality.<sup>31</sup> About one-third of those who replied to this question

<sup>29</sup> "The nearest centre for me is four to five hours by train, but one of my colleagues has found material in his line within two hours' travel."

"Nearest place where work can be done is 77 miles away."

<sup>30</sup> "One of the great needs is a fund for travelling by American scholars to the libraries in the different parts of the United States as well as to Europe. I merely observe that the instructor in history in a small college can not excuse his relinquishment of research entirely by the smallness and inadequacy of his library. Often his own lack of vision is responsible also." See note 3.

<sup>31</sup> "There is a feeling of indifference towards subjects for research of a local nature. Professor Turner's insistence on the importance of local history, and the work of our state historical society, taken together, have done much to change this sentiment, but not enough to destroy it entirely. Graduate students clamor for subjects of 'national importance'. Some faculty members are always planning to write on the Monroe Doctrine, or some other over-worked subject which sounds big."

thought that research was hindered or delayed because of a belief that only a large subject was worth while for such purposes.

The answers to the seventh question show that seventy per cent. believe that one of the major obstacles to research is the excessive cost of publication and lack of suitable media. The answers read: "very serious"; "outstanding cause of low production". "This I should say is one of the important obstacles." "Very discouraging situation." "Yes, I think so, in fact I know so to my sorrow." "Major menace." One struggling author reports that he spent \$2800 to publish his book (in addition to the cost of research and preparation) "although I had no money of my own at the time". A recommendation from a "doctoral committee" urging the value of a thesis, and the great desirability of publishing it, led a large publishing house to write that they would be glad to publish the study if the author would advance \$1600. One discouraged Ph.D. who is in an institution that makes no provision for helping its doctors publish and lacks a "series", declares that the only way to get a book published is to die, "then they will publish it in your memory".<sup>32</sup>

Under present conditions the cost of publishing the Ph.D. dissertation is, for a large number of students, almost prohibitive. This discourages many from even considering the preparation of another study, because of a belief that the publication can only be carried out at great personal expense.<sup>33</sup> Publishers also have an eye to the cost and profits. They want "popular" books and articles, for anything else will not pay.<sup>34</sup>

"I have the impression that your committee might do much to emphasize the importance of small jobs which are reasonably complete in themselves, but are part of a larger scheme towards which the individual may work. A good research programme on the part of the American Historical Association would, I am sure, be of help to many of the isolated workers."

<sup>32</sup> "Ah, here you have the big thing. If we could be even reasonably certain that the results of our investigations could be published otherwise than at our own expense, the output would be enormously increased."

"This is one of the outstanding causes of low production. Several men of my acquaintance have stated to me that there was no use in writing because they would have to pay for publication after the work was done."

<sup>33</sup> "In my own case, one of the strongest incentives for beginning a new study came from having an earlier one published."

"Probably the rebuffs received by the newly created Ph.D. when he seeks a publisher for his thesis cause him to become so discouraged that he has no heart for further research."

<sup>34</sup> "It is easier to get popular stuff published than scientific. The middleman can get his work published when the scholar can not. The trouble here is not with the publishers but with the public."

Most correspondents believe that the lack of suitable media for publication is a great obstacle to research. Those who deny this are usually men located in the larger universities having a "series" or special funds for publication, or they are able to persuade historical societies to publish their studies. In spite of the number of historical journals, and of patriotic, religious, racial, and other societies that have organs for publication, most of these are so limited in their scope that many worth-while small pieces of research fail to fit their needs. This obstacle applies with even greater force to larger studies of a scholarly character, written sometimes by men of national reputation, to monographs, such as doctor's theses, and to articles having general significance. This view is confirmed by the answers to questions 7 and 8.

The opportunities for publishing short studies in history as compared with the opportunities in many fields of science are certainly meagre. The Utopia reported by one correspondent is so exceptional that it may be offered as an ideal solution. "At our university a good piece of research, *e.g.*, a monograph of 200 or more pages, approved by the proper committee, will be published by the University Press without expense to the instructor producing it." In Germany many great scholars made their names largely by brief but significant publications issued in the form of pamphlets. One calls to mind the great significance of the pamphlet literature of the American Revolution. It seems a pity that this relatively inexpensive medium lacks favor in this country. A book often means overextending the theme or "padding". But there seems to be no happy medium available for the publication of studies between an article of a few thousand words and a book of seventy-five thousand or more.<sup>85</sup>

On the other hand some express the belief that authors who produce really valuable pieces of research have no difficulty in getting them printed; that there is much "hack-research" by ordinary men; that the attempt to print indiscriminately or on a much larger scale would result in the publication of a lot of "trash". Taking conditions as they are, the very pertinent question arises, to what extent effort should be made to increase materially the present percentage of productive scholars. Some believe that there would be considerable danger in stimulating research and publication by the wholesale, because of the probable deterioration in the quality of the product. "Besides, there are people of brains who are asking, in this age of question-marks, What is the good? And what is the good? I ask you." No doubt this somewhat pessimistic observer is disturbed by the fact that not a little research now being published

<sup>85</sup> "Yes, we ought to print in paper bindings only."

is not worth while, estimated by one correspondent as high as one-half of the total. Another thinks that many dissertations are poor pieces of work, notwithstanding that they are produced under supervision, and even written in part by the "professor in charge".<sup>36</sup> Others believe that relatively few men are likely to produce valuable studies; that no educational system or policy can produce an output of leaders only; that there is no possibility of a large number of men having the group of qualities that would enable them to become productive scholars. Why waste money and time, then, by trying to induce people to write who ought not to do so?

Several editors of historical magazines are very dubious about the quality of pieces of research offered for publication. One writes that our methods of higher education, and the emphasis on "production" for promotion, probably stimulate the preparation of too many unimportant and mediocre research works. "As managing editor of . . . reading countless such manuscripts, I come into close contact with this tragedy." Another complains that his chief difficulties as editor are, on the one hand, an excess of offerings from men under forty who have not learned to write, and, on the other hand, a deficit from the "oldsters" who have. A third complains that he has received but one manuscript in a year that was in first-class shape for printing. The editors however come in for some criticism, such as of partiality in their selection and printing of articles, and failure to seek out, stimulate, and encourage talented writers, especially the younger men.

Question 8 uncovered, seemingly, an unexpected gold mine of valuable productions, already completed, together with an astonishing number of projected and partly completed pieces of research that could be finished speedily if a grant were forthcoming. The very enthusiastic response to this question is a matter which might well arouse great optimism respecting the general attitude of Ph.D.'s toward research; but also some grave doubts and suspicions regarding these well-meaning promises. One explanation, perhaps, is the vision of summer vacations in Washington, London, or Paris, perhaps taking the bride along, and the completion of large original exhaustive pieces of work based "wholly on the sources", the surface of which "has only been scratched by all previous workers". Apparently any little old grant would be sufficient to start the research mill a-

<sup>36</sup> "If these students were left to themselves and expected to publish something in later life the results would be horrifying. Instead of expecting every person with a Ph.D. degree to produce we should, I think, confer a distinguished service medal on such of them as do not produce. It is better in the long run for historical science and for the reputation of our gild." See note 39.

grinding, and it would not stop until the money, wind, or gas gave out entirely.

On the other hand there appears to be a considerable number of important pieces of research now held up because publishers demand from one to two thousand dollars in advance before they will consider publication. The financial sacrifice asked of historians is certainly a most serious problem. The cost of producing books has enormously increased in ten years, in relation to salaries, travel, food, clerical help, paper, labor, etc. It is unreasonable to expect a Ph.D. to pay half of his year's salary, or more, to publish a book that has already cost him perhaps several thousand dollars. "Its depressing effect almost stifles at times the desire to do research."<sup>37</sup>

That grants in aid would greatly increase production is certain. If properly guarded there seems to be no reason why production so stimulated should not be of high quality. The pieces of investigation under way or completed are in a number of cases by men of national reputation. Under present circumstances they can not be published because the cost is prohibitive. It is not likely that salaries could be increased sufficiently to cover such expenses. Therefore endowments, grants in aid, and other forms of help seem to be the only solution of what is acknowledged to be one of the major reasons why there is no more productive research.

The reasons why so many students fail to complete their work and take their degree are varied. Many are incompetent and are told not to go on. Some leave, because of an offer of work. Some are offered positions and departing never return, perhaps because of marriage, or inertia, or belief that it will not pay to go on. Sometimes the cause may be dissatisfaction with the character of the instruction. The dread of the examinations is a deterring factor, for it often covers more ground than should be expected of the candidate, and more minute memory-knowledge, in particular portions of the subject of history, than should be exacted.

The replies to question 10 were in some respects more interesting and went to the heart of the problem more directly than the answers to the more specific questions. The fact is, the problem is much more complex than would appear at first sight. We are confronted with those "imponderables" that can not be measured quantitatively

<sup>37</sup> "I am willing to make any sacrifice necessary to do this, but can not see that I have the right in the face of my small salary, \$3000 (which in Chicago would equal \$3600), to ask my wife to sacrifice ordinary social pleasures to which she has a right, house furnishings that are not extravagant, the convenience and pleasure of having a car, the freedom from doing the family washing and scrubbing. Neither is it right to my children to use her time in that manner and to have me use nearly all my time for history, and to deprive them of protection in case of my death."

but are nevertheless fundamental. One we have referred to—the problem of the prevailing theory of education. In the words of Herbert Spencer, “What knowledge is of most worth?” Historically the colleges were established mainly to convey to each generation a body of organized knowledge, thought to be of great value to the individual and to society. This knowledge was in part cultural and in part vocational. While the kind of knowledge has varied—classical, literary, religious, political, economic, scientific, and social—information has been the goal in view. In the past, neither professors nor students were under any obligation to do much more than to study the books provided and absorb their contents. But in this age of scientific, and now social, research, the effort to discover new knowledge has, in the opinion of many, forced on the universities, and even on the smaller colleges, a new obligation. They must, of course, conserve and pass on knowledge already discovered and organized, but they are also under obligation to encourage their professors to discover new knowledge.

The widespread demand for more emphasis on research in the colleges is due to a number of factors: to the method of training Ph.D.'s, to the emphasis placed on the dissertation, to the place of research in the sciences and in modern industrial life, and to the belief that it is a desirable method of education. Research is believed by many to be at least equal in value to teaching. The colleges, it is asserted, would serve students and society better if they devoted more time to encouraging research as a method of education as well as for the possible results of research. For the great need now is that of developing certain mental processes in the professor and student, processes that the practice of research is most likely to produce—namely, the questioning attitude; the desire to prove that knowledge alleged to be true is really true; the desire to extend the bounds of human knowledge. Professors and students who do not engage in some research are in danger of worshipping the idols of dogma and precedent. Such an attitude of mind hinders the advance of knowledge, for it weakens that profound reverence for truth which enables one to accept new evidence, when it overthrows customary or preconceived ideas. If time given to research results in less total information, there is compensation in the fact that professors and students have obtained some power and technic in acquiring and applying information when needed; and that both, as a result, are better able to evaluate knowledge as well as more likely to extend its bounds.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>38</sup> “To breed thinkers, not to stuff a man with knowledge, but to teach him how to discover and to use knowledge.”



Yet many distrust this method of education, mainly because their idea of education still centres on the acquisition of organized knowledge. If this is the major aim for education, then it should take a major part of the time of a really good and up-to-date professor. For he must acquaint himself with his subject, become a master of its literature, and keep abreast of the latest developments in his subject. He must know books, rather than the documents out of which books are made. His interest must be centred on passing on to the rising generation the knowledge and experience of the race as fast as it is discovered and recorded. He himself is therefore a spectator at the great game of discovering knowledge rather than a participator.

Owing to the nature of the demand and the character of the candidates, the graduate schools have developed a system of graduate training which does not lead to much productive research after the candidate receives his degree. Searching, not to say scathing, criticism of "the system" comes from both experienced professors and recent graduates. It is asserted, for example, that the dissertation is looked on as the end rather than the beginning of productive efforts; that the candidate often becomes discouraged because the teaching and training are "deadening"; that the "lectures" of many professors fail to inspire the student and to create in him the passion for research. In other words there is a failure to teach students to *want* to do research, not only with respect to the dissertation but after its completion. It is asserted also that staleness comes from too many college lectures in proportion to research courses. Criticism is made of the "hot-house" character of the theses; that too much aid is given, and that "coddling" is resorted to; that this results in the lack of ability to pursue independent investigation.<sup>39</sup> Some professors come

<sup>39</sup> "The general system of American education brings in students to the graduate schools less well prepared than those of European countries. Therefore we have the deadening and the discouraging after-effects upon the doctor of philosophy: 1, of having to be taught in the university what he should have learned in the college, or in the college what he should have learned in the secondary school; 2, of having to be guided, directed, urged, pampered, nursed as it were all the way along, from aid in the discovery to help in the use of materials; 3, of having his dissertation in manuscript, in galley, in page form, and in book form read, revised, or otherwise amended by the 'professor in charge'; and 4, of knowing that, not he alone, but the university and the professors may be judged in accordance with the merits or demerits of the performance. Too often is it apt to be the case, therefore, that, as a means of shielding the university and the professor from adverse criticism, because of the rivalry among American institutions of higher learning, the work of the candidate is in considerable part the handiwork of the professor. Artificially propagated, our doctors of philosophy in history, as in other fields of learning, increase in numbers but not in intellectual productivity."

Dr. Jameson says: "I am convinced that most universities make too formidable a job of the doctoral dissertation, and that therefore a good many young men,

in for further criticism, not only for lack of power to inspire, but because they are unproductive, are narrow specialists, do not give adequate instruction in the technic of research, assign either petty or too large subjects for theses, and fail to keep in touch with their students after graduation. It is obvious that the individual professor is the "keeper to the gate of research—and should inspire in his followers the intellectual curiosity to seek new horizons, as well as to show them how to row the boat". If he fails to create a desire and passion in the able students to continue their research after receiving the degree, then this is a major reason why there is not more productive research.<sup>40</sup>

Another general reason for lack of productive research concerns the ability of the candidates, in relation to the demand for teachers who have received their degree. It is asserted that the Ph.D. degree in history has become commercialized; that it has become primarily a *teaching* degree; that large numbers are given the degree, when it is believed that they are unlikely to become consistent producers; that many candidates have no intention of producing, after graduation wearied by the magnitude of the effort and disheartened by its expense, have little courage to tackle anything more. . . . He can learn those arts of continuous research and methodical construction and composition, which it is of course necessary for him to learn, quite as well by producing a monograph of a hundred pages as by producing one of six or seven hundred. Often the subjects which result in these enormous tomes are really too big for a beginner; require more maturity."

Professor J. H. Robinson remarks: "After all, the requirements for the doctor's degree are not so very unlike the earlier process of education . . . writing papers and taking examinations. It is not so fresh and stimulating an experience as one would wish. The doctor's dissertation is, like its forerunners, rather the end than the beginning of development. So taking a Ph.D. degree is on the whole the climax of the intellectually demoralizing process of education as commonly understood and practised. It does not herald a new mental era. . . . The moral of this is that the preparation for the doctor's degree should be re-examined with a view to finding out how the rather deadening effects of earlier scholastic experiences can be overcome and how the student can be encouraged to develop and indulge a spirit of honest curiosity. He should learn the difficulties of superior work and something of the lives of those who accomplish it. This would help him more than accumulations of technical knowledge and the carrying out of tasks set by his instructors. Whether we can some time learn how to teach others to want to learn is the fundamental question."

<sup>40</sup> A noted professor writes: "I have sometimes doubted whether, if I had had a thorough undergraduate and graduate training in my own subject (of American history), I should have found the interest and opportunity in it which I found without such special hammering."

"I am teaching because I feel that I have an aptitude for it and I know that I have a very keen interest in it. I am not 'producing', first for the reason that you suggest in your questionnaire, namely, that I haven't the time during the school year and can not afford it in the summer. The main reason however is that I have no interest in research. . . . That is the whole story."

tion, and look on the degree as a passport or certificate necessary to get a "job". Likewise presidents, especially of the smaller colleges, insist on having Ph.D.'s on their faculty, not because they expect or wish them to be productive scholars, but largely for advertising purposes. The large universities are thus crowded with mediocre graduate students, many of whom can not be taught the technic of research except with great difficulty. It is still more difficult, and often impossible, to inspire them with a passion for research. Low salaries and greater rewards in other professions draw off the best talent and leave those with meagre abilities as candidates for the Ph.D. in history. Thus an undue proportion of the professor's time is consumed, and he is hindered in his own productive work.<sup>41</sup>

A fourth general reason for lack of production is the low social value placed on scholarship in the United States as compared with European countries. In particular the assertion is made that the country does not care for research in the social sciences, in comparison for example with the value it places on research in the physical sciences; that when research is done, it receives little social recognition; that when society and the nation honor scholarship more, then improvement will take place. The principal reasons given for this state of affairs are first the low level of culture in America, as compared with Europe or England, and second the value placed on material progress as measured in dollars and cents.<sup>42</sup>

A fifth important reason for lack of production is a widespread

<sup>41</sup> This is Professor W. E. Dodd's analysis: "And here come the problems: the ambitious young folk enter business, for that leads to what modern society calls success, the handling of vast sums of money or evidences of money. The second class or even the third class of young folk enter upon the professions, perhaps the lesser lights upon the profession of teaching. Business dulls and deadens the minds of the capable; the professions lead into high specializations (medicine, law) or into a slow broadening of the minds of the less intellectual (preaching and teaching and writing). What we have then is to take in the main the poorest material and make of it the thinking element of the country. The problem of the doctorate then resolves itself into a task of teaching weak minds to use what talents there may be. The weakness of the whole doctor's degree business is that the colleges have commercialized it and made it a teacher's degree. If it could be rescued, I would favor making the master's degree a teacher's degree."

"The demand of colleges and universities for the Ph.D. degree as prerequisite for a permanent position in the college has tended to commercialize the doctorate. . . . I have lived through the period in the South when a Ph.D. as a necessity for college teaching was not dreamed of, to the time when it has become a necessity."

<sup>42</sup> "Yes, most men are not unselfish enough to engage in research that does not carry with it marked prestige. There is relatively little work done for the mere sake of the results attained. There is also little general social recognition for scholarship *per se*."

"Surely none is so blind as not to see the outstanding fact. American academic life is really not attuned to research; it never has been; it is less so every day."

belief that research does not pay. It is alleged that many who are productive fail to gain the reward they might reasonably expect; that presidents of colleges and universities give lip-service to research, but do not take it into consideration, to any great extent, in making promotions or increases in salary; that therefore Ph.D.'s seek to advance by teaching, wire-pulling, and "social stunts".<sup>43</sup>

It is believed that there are about six hundred Ph.D.'s in history living in the United States and that the annual increase is fifty or more. The evidence points to the conclusion that less than twenty-five per cent. are consistent producers. Two schools of thought are represented in the answers to the questionnaire. One considers that the situation will take care of itself; that production will follow the law of the survival of the fittest; that the best will produce anyway, no matter what the conditions. In fact it is argued that while the stimulation of research by artificial methods would result perhaps in a greater quantity of output, much of it would be of poor quality.

The second school believes that there is much light hidden under a bushel; that there is much latent talent that ought to be developed; that worth-while pieces of research, in process and completed, are now held up, partly from lack of encouragement and partly because of the cost of publication; that the percentage of producers is too low, and that it is desirable, both from the standpoint of teaching and of research, to increase this percentage.

The answers to the questionnaire indicate that the second school has much greater support; that the desire to carry on research seems to be more general than has been heretofore suspected; that there is widespread dissatisfaction with existing conditions; and that reforms are desired. The blame for the lack of more productive research is distributed rather widely: on defects in the system of graduate instruction; on deficiencies of some of the professors; on the granting of degrees to too many candidates who have little or no interest in research; on those presidents of colleges who fail to reward re-

<sup>43</sup> "The reason is that the rewards in history, as the present personnel of the profession proves, are conferred for administrative ability, personal qualities in the classroom and drawing room, and social relationship and influence. The youngest Ph.D. can see that some of the most prominent men have written little or nothing and that many men who have written a great deal seem to get nowhere, either in their universities or in the profession. Q.E.D. The important thing is not research." See note 17.

Most Ph.D.'s "prefer the human contacts with their students or with their colleagues to the isolation, steady grind, and slowness of reward which are inevitably the lot of the man who sticks to productive scholarship. In other words, the average doctor of philosophy does not want to be a greasy grind all his life. He has to be till he gets his doctor's degree, and in many cases he says: 'Thank God, I have got it', and quits."

search; on the lack of time, because of excessive teaching schedules, and on the lack of money because of low salaries or lack of grants to defray the cost of publication; and in general to the low esteem in which scholarship and research, in the social sciences at least, are held in the United States.

The principal remedies for the solution of the problem are suggested by the analysis of the answers to the questionnaire. They may be summed up briefly at this point together with some suggestions not heretofore mentioned. It is clear that the Ph.D. degree does not mean much as a *research* degree. It is essentially a *teaching* degree as it always has been. Perhaps stimulated by the present emphasis on research in the physical, and now in the social, sciences, many believe that the time has come for conferring two different degrees. One should be given after a different training from that now given for the Ph.D. It should certify the fitness of the candidate for teaching.<sup>44</sup> The second should be given after a very complete training in research. It should certify proved ability in research, plus the *passion* for it. In other words, let the university declare its belief that the candidate will be a consistent productive scholar and confer a real research degree. Another plan is that of making a clearer distinction, especially in the larger colleges and universities, between those members of faculties who are good teachers and those who are good research men.<sup>45</sup> The latter should not be heavily burdened with teaching as is now so often the case. Instead they should be granted temporary or partial release from teaching, when it is evident that they will thereby produce important pieces of research.

The following "remedies" if generally applied would certainly bring about more productive work of a higher grade.

I. "*Passion.*" A greater *passion for research* must be developed. More professors and students in all colleges must somehow acquire the desire to extend human knowledge through their *own* research. Professors responsible for training graduate students must make greater effort to stimulate this passion and follow up their students after graduation.

II. *Opportunity.* Presidents, executives, and chairmen of departments must recognize Ph.D.'s who have the *flair* for research and

<sup>44</sup> "I personally would welcome an experiment by some university of a higher degree, requirements for which will be quite on a par with those of the Ph.D. in research but which will be primarily for the purpose of preparing a man for teaching. Such a degree I feel ought to have some training in research, but it ought to have much more training than our present Ph.D. gives in the problems and methods of teaching and the general literature which a teacher finds useful."

<sup>45</sup> See note 14.

give them greater encouragement, by granting promotion and increase of salary for proven ability to produce worth-while research. They must also give more weight to research in calling men to fill vacant positions.

III. *Selection of Candidate.* More productive work will follow, relatively to the total number of Ph.D.'s in history, if, first, a greater emphasis is placed on selecting candidates who give the most evidence that they will produce; and secondly, if there is a more thorough weeding-out process during the period of study for the degree.

IV. *Money.* More money is indispensable, in the form of special grants, for travel and publication. The founding of research professorships with a minimum of formal teaching is another form of aid to research.

V. *Scholarship.* Scholarship must be more generally recognized in the professional world and by the general public; and the scholar must be given more social recognition in one form or another, prestige, honor, promotion, or financial reward.

The answers to the questionnaire indicate that the percentage of desirable productive scholars can be increased if these remedies are applied. If in the next ten years we may assume that our universities graduate five hundred Ph.D.'s in history of much higher ability than the average at present, and that fifty per cent. instead of twenty-five per cent. become consistent producers, then we may begin to hope for a new epoch in higher education in the United States.

MARCUS W. JERNEGAN.



## LORD GEORGE GERMAIN IN OFFICE, 1775-1782

WHEN in 1775 the king and Lord North decided to coerce the Americans, they entrusted the task to a man who had been court-martialled, declared unfit to serve the king in any military capacity, and ejected from the Privy Council. Posterity has taken the hint, and has dismissed him, almost without consideration, as a failure.

Lord George Sackville Germain, then in his sixtieth year, was the third son of the first Duke of Dorset. Educated at Westminster and at Trinity College, Dublin, he entered the army in 1737 after some administrative experience in Ireland. His military progress was honorable and successful until, in 1759, the incident occurred which blighted the rest of his life. As commander-in-chief of the British forces at Minden, he refused to obey the orders of the allied commander, Ferdinand of Brunswick, and to go into action; and, being at his own request tried by a military court, he was ignominiously dismissed from the service. Public opinion, though not unanimous, was mainly against him, and his position in society became an unenviable one. He was, at least once, burned in effigy, and "led a most weary life".<sup>1</sup>

With the accession of George III. and the influence of Bute, his prospects improved. He reappeared at court; the king was civil to him; and in 1761 he again spoke in Parliament. By 1763 he was encouraged to expect favor, and two years later was appointed Vice-Treasurer for Ireland in the Rockingham ministry. This step, like every other in his advancement, was greeted with some echo of the indignation which had exiled him. Chatham regarded his restoration to the Privy Council as an insult; and Germain's appointment was a main obstacle in keeping Chatham and Rockingham apart. Other ministers were shy of claiming credit as sponsor to so unpopular a colleague.<sup>2</sup>

By the early 'seventies, when Lord North was in power, Germain had gained a position of some importance in the House, where he aspired to lead the Whig opposition.<sup>3</sup> Horace Walpole admired his "sound ability", and loudly praised the "nervous compactness" and

<sup>1</sup> Historical MSS. Commission, report on Eyre-Matcham MSS. in *Reports on Various Collections*, VI. 44; *ibid.*, report on Laing MSS., p. 425.

<sup>2</sup> Emily F. D. Osborn, *Political and Social Letters of a Lady of the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1891), p. 128.

<sup>3</sup> Burke to Rockingham, Nov. 11, 1772, Jan. 10, 1773.

"pithy manly sentences" in which he would express all that there was to be said on a particular question.<sup>4</sup> The same critic singled out one of Germain's speeches to illustrate his statement that 1773-1774 was a year of fine harangues; and the *Parliamentary History* characterized his speeches as showing great knowledge and masterly quickness.<sup>5</sup> The Whigs were afraid of him, and when in 1774 the American crisis forced Germain more and more into disagreement with their views, the process of changing sides—not a difficult one—was but one step towards gaining ministerial reward for impressive ability, in a government which above all needed outstanding talents and especially oratorical influence in the Lower House.

In American policy Germain stood on firm ground. The reception of the Stamp Act had found him distressed and puzzled by a situation which promised no happy issue; and he soon decided that nothing but military force could bring about a settlement. He opposed repeal, and believed that the Americans must be prevented from "stealing a constitution they had no right to". "Nothing", he said, "is so likely to produce confusion as vigour unably exerted." In 1774 he declared that the wavering policy of different ministers was the fatal note of British administration, and urged strong measures to restore due obedience from America and to "prevent men of a mercantile cast . . . collecting themselves together and debating about political matters". He doubted if firmness would be put to an actual test, and urged a "Roman severity" in support of that British dignity which he regarded as indispensable to the colonial relationship.<sup>6</sup>

Thus he stood for definiteness in policy, when the government was in the hands of North and Dartmouth, waverers who knew themselves as such; and to him they turned when fortune forced them into an aggressive attitude. Germain was on intimate terms with Mansfield and Wedderburn and was thus accessible to frequent consultation;<sup>7</sup> and in proportion as his fears increased—as they did after Concord—so he goaded the administration to more decisive action. By the middle of 1775 he was sending detailed recommendations to Lord Suffolk,<sup>8</sup> the Northern Secretary of State; whilst Generals Howe and Burgoyne looked to him as the advocate of a policy

<sup>4</sup> Walpole, *Last Journals*, I. 233, 133.

<sup>5</sup> Cobbett, *Parliamentary History*, 1770-1774, p. 1122.

<sup>6</sup> Historical MSS. Commission, *Report on Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, I. 103, 108, 127, 133; Cobbett, *Parliamentary History*, 1770-1774, pp. 1162, 1194; 1774-1777, p. 192; Walpole, *Last Journals*, I. 313.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 423-424.

<sup>8</sup> Historical MSS. Commission, *Report on Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, II. 1-3.

which would exert the utmost force to finish the rebellion in one campaign.<sup>9</sup>

In this way Germain reached a position from which Barré could accuse him of dominating North;<sup>10</sup> and as the crisis became plain the ministry decided to bring him openly to their aid. According to Horace Walpole, he won his Tory spurs by supporting North's policy while still *apparently* in opposition; and the debate on the regulation of the government of Massachusetts Bay lends probability to this statement.<sup>11</sup> In October, 1775, there were suggestions of his being made commissioner with full power to arrange a settlement;<sup>12</sup> and a few weeks later he was approached as a likely Secretary of State. Even after the proposal had been made to him, it was difficult to arrange the changes of office but ultimately Dartmouth was transferred to the office of Privy Seal, and Germain took his place. An interesting constitutional point was settled by his being appointed one of the Principal Secretaries, whereas his predecessors had been vaguely limited to their colonial duties;<sup>13</sup> but in practice Germain came into charge of American affairs by an arrangement which the king regarded as strengthening the hands of government; which Rodney applauded; and which Horace Walpole contrasted favorably with the former ministerial indolence.<sup>14</sup>

The new minister was on his first appearance "very much flustered", and was greeted with some unhandsome remarks; and though he expressed himself satisfied that all passed as he could wish, he nevertheless had some misgivings. He did not seem to speak with so much weight, now that he was in office. The "Ghost of Minden" was "forever brought in neck and shoulders to frighten him with".<sup>15</sup> He even told his friend, Irwin that he would have preferred to escape. So with hopes and fears he entered upon the great task of solving the American riddle. "Pity me, encourage me", he besought his friend, "and I will do my best."<sup>16</sup>

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 137.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> Walpole, *Last Journals*, I. 325; *Parliamentary History*, 1770-1774, pp. 1192-1196.

<sup>12</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, *loc. cit.*, II. 10-11.

<sup>13</sup> A. H. Basye, "The Secretary of State for the Colonies, 1768-1782", in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVIII. 13-23; Minutes for Royal Order, Dec. (?), 1775; Eden to Wedderburn, Dec. 16, 1775; Wedderburn to Eden, Dec. 17, 1775, in Auckland MSS. in King's College, Cambridge (Stevens's *Facsimiles*, nos. 857-859).

<sup>14</sup> W. B. Donne, *Correspondence of George III. with Lord North*, I. 256-257; *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, II. 18-19.

<sup>15</sup> Historical MSS. Commission, *Report on Carlisle MSS.*, p. 311.

<sup>16</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, I. 138.

The new American secretary was a tall, well-built man of nearly sixty, with a manner that appeared cold until transformed by friendship or disturbed by criticism. Plunged early into public life he felt a deeper debt to experience than to education, and preferred the open air to the library. Gifted with a quick eye and quick perception, he was a shrewd judge of men and of parties, and could express himself in clear but unstudied phrase, bordering on negligence. Impetuous and impulsive in youth, he preserved at this time an excess of dogmatic self-confidence, which, while it led him to an almost exaggerated love of order and punctuality, made him impatient of any plan but his own, reluctant to admit criticism, and inconsiderate in overriding the wishes of others. A careless self-assurance characterized his public appearances, and he seemed to feel but little the responsibilities of his task. Too obstinate to prepare for failure, he was often left without resource; the screen of levity spurred the taunts of his opponents, and he would lose his self-control in an outburst which perhaps betrayed a ministerial secret that the urbane tranquillity of North had safely defended. An outburst in public would be followed in private by a mood of depression; and in gloomy discontent or in petulant irritability he would offer or threaten to resign his post until overborne by calmer moments and by his more even-tempered colleague. A dark streak ran through his character: some called it melancholy, others malice. The affair of Minden had blighted a career that would probably have led to the first place in government; it had left grievances, animosities, and sensitiveness to frequent insult. Thus it was that the man who was honestly regarded by some as the ablest war minister that could have been found, and who made a deep impression of ability and affection on many closely associated with him, was nevertheless lacking in the one great quality essential for his task—cool, far-sighted statesmanship.

In entering office Germain declared that he did so upon the same principle which he had openly held hitherto, that British sovereignty must be maintained with the right of taxation. This right, he admitted, need not be exercised, though he himself hoped for a revenue

<sup>17</sup> Estimates of Germain's character by personal friends can be found in the following works: Richard Cumberland, *Memoirs*, I. 394-399; Nathaniel Wraxall, *Historical Memoirs of My Own Time*, pp. 307 et seq.; Hist. MSS. Comm., Knox MSS., in *Reports on Various Collections*, VI. 193; *Correspondence of William, First Baron Auckland*, I. 350-351; J. Nichols, *Recollections*, I. 351. Hostile characterizations by Shelburne and Arthur Lee, respectively, are printed in Fitzmaurice, *Life of William, Earl of Shelburne*, I. 236-251, and in Force's *American Archives*, fifth series, II. 456. Works on the identity of "Junius" (by Coventry, Jaques, etc.) also contain sketches, of little original interest.

from America; "but if we are to have no peace unless we give up the right, the contest is brought to a fair issue; we are equal to that contest; our internal resources are great; and we can never despair of that assistance which we may want".<sup>18</sup> His own advancement to power encouraged him to foresee success; and by December he was described in great spirits, hoping to end all the trouble after one campaign.<sup>19</sup>

His appointment had been a tacit admission that the ministry were now determined to stand firm for the right of sovereignty; but this admission was not whole-hearted, and as long as North and Dartmouth had any influence it was unlikely that a consistent policy of coercion could be maintained. Thus before Germain had been six months in office, divided counsels led to the first of those Cabinet disagreements which, fomented later by personal animosities which North did not share, caused the American secretary to attempt resignation several times between 1776 and 1782.

Early in 1776 Lord Howe and his brother Sir William were appointed commissioners to treat with the revolted colonies. When the terms of their instructions were discussed it at once appeared that there was wide variance of opinion.<sup>20</sup> Germain insisted that the Americans should be required to acknowledge that very authority of Parliament which was disputed; that is, he regarded the commission merely as giving power to accept submission. North attempted to avoid this initial requirement, but Germain, believing that to do so meant eventual concession, held out against any negotiation until the colonies should make the declaration; whereupon Dartmouth, desiring conciliation, threatened to resign forthwith; and even North stated that he would not continue in office if such a rigorous condition were insisted upon. Germain retorted by suggesting that he should go himself. Suffolk and Wedderburn had previously urged him not to attach too much importance to what might be only a matter of verbiage and had pointed out how fatal his resignation would be to the policy of coercion. They, like him, would oppose any plan really derogatory to Parliamentary authority.<sup>21</sup>

Faced thus by strong opposition, North proposed to refer the differences to Lord Mansfield; and the result was that the commissioners were instructed not to make any advances, but merely to wait for offers from the colonies. If such offers did not include the

<sup>18</sup> *Parliamentary History*, 1774-1777, pp. 989-991.

<sup>19</sup> *Carlisle MSS.*, p. 306.

<sup>20</sup> *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, Knox MSS., in *Reports on Various Collections*, VI. 258 et seq.

<sup>21</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, II. 23-25.

recognition of Parliamentary supremacy, the commission must await further orders before acting. The difficulty, however, was not yet over. Lord Howe, seeing his functions as commissioner thus prescribed, refused to serve, and it was only after much discussion and smoothing over of the limitation that he was finally prevailed upon.<sup>22</sup> Germain had in fact succeeded in preventing any real conciliatory move which would, as he thought, sacrifice the success of his policy. As Knox put it, "having now collected a vast force, and having a fair prospect of subduing the colonies, he wished to reduce them before he treated at all"; and in Parliament he hardly concealed his contempt for the idea of negotiation. "It was necessary, that the intentions of Parliament be complied with."<sup>23</sup>

For the successes of Carleton in Canada during the same year Germain was in no way responsible. Unfortunate as were his relations with Admiral Lord Howe, due to earlier association, his attitude to Carleton was still more dangerous. Germain seems early to have developed a dislike of Carleton, not unconnected with the latter's refusal to accommodate a friend of his; the general's ironic letters soon made the alienation complete. The king deliberately discounted his opinion on account of this animus,<sup>24</sup> and it was in face of the minister's opposition that Carleton was decorated with the Order of the Bath in 1776.<sup>25</sup> It is only fair to Germain to bear in mind the fact that Carleton's slowness gave just ground for criticism,<sup>26</sup> but it is hardly possible to doubt that there was rancor as well as dissatisfaction in the minister's mind.

The campaign of 1777 which ended with Burgoyne's surrender at Saratoga might alone be made a basis for an estimate of Germain's ability to direct a military plan, were it not for the extreme difficulty, if not the impossibility of determining the proportion in which responsibility was divided between the American secretary, the Cabinet, and the king. Such an examination must be deferred for separate treatment; and it must here suffice to note a few points concerning the well-known story.

The scheme evolved out of the obvious and reasonable policy of holding New York and the line of the Hudson, thereby separating New England from her southerly neighbors; and some scheme of a convergence on the Hudson was expected by Howe quite apart from

<sup>22</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, II. 25-28; Donne, *Correspondence of George III. with Lord North*, II. 18.

<sup>23</sup> Force, *American Archives*, fourth series, VI. 384.

<sup>24</sup> Donne, *op. cit.*, II. 44.

<sup>25</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, II. 39, 42.

<sup>26</sup> E. Stuart-Wortley, *A Prime Minister and his Son*, p. 103; J. W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, III. 180, 204, 205.



the definite instructions which came to Carleton and Burgoyne in 1777.<sup>27</sup> In February, 1777, Burgoyne submitted a memorandum which was used as the foundation of the campaign, but in the hands of the king and his ministers significant alterations were made, and the probability is that these alterations were due originally to the king.<sup>28</sup> In its amended form, the commander had not the alternative which Burgoyne gave, of shipping his forces to New York if the land route seemed impracticable; and the suggestion of a possible diversion was turned into part of the plan as ordered, whereas Burgoyne had doubted if the numbers would justify it. Finally, in his despatches from the colonial office Germain approved Howe's campaign to the southward, although it should have been clear that he might well be unable to complete it in time to co-operate with the army advancing from Canada. Moreover when Howe wrote that, owing to his receiving only one-fifth of the reinforcements asked for, he would be obliged to go more slowly, Germain contented himself with the hope that Howe would be able to finish in time to join Burgoyne.<sup>29</sup> Although the whole scheme has generally been regarded as one demanding exact co-ordination, Germain hardly seems to have insisted on this, and was content to give Burgoyne definite instructions while Howe received only vague hopes. A memorandum among Germain's papers states plainly that a junction between Burgoyne and Howe was regarded only as desirable, by no means as essential;<sup>30</sup> and when it became certain that co-operation was impossible, the minister with characteristic sangunity wrote to his secretary: "The more honour for Burgoyne if he does the business without any assistance from New York."<sup>31</sup> If these statements truly represent ministerial policy, they do not exonerate Germain. They do however transfer the blame for failure to the scheme itself, rather than to the administration of it—that is, to the king and ministry rather than to Germain alone.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>27</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, II. 52.

<sup>28</sup> Fortescue, *op. cit.*, p. 205 *et seq.* Burgoyne's memorandum with the king's notes on it is printed in E. B. De Fonblanque, *Right Honorable John Burgoyne*, pp. 483-487.

<sup>29</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, II. 63-65.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 88-89.

<sup>31</sup> Knox MSS., in *Reports on Various Collections*, VI. 139.

<sup>32</sup> This view may lead to a slight modification of opinion regarding the confused story of Germain's carelessness in sending Howe detailed instructions. Shelburne encouraged the legend (Fitzmaurice, *Shelburne*, I. 248) that Howe never received orders because Germain refused to keep his horses standing. This is probably less than the truth, as Knox's memorandum (Knox MSS., *Various Collections*, VI. 277) shows that Germain arranged for Howe to receive a copy of those to Burgoyne. Egerton quotes the memorandum in his *American Revolution* and dis-

Responsibility for the failure was certainly assumed by the ministry as a whole. Carleton had implied in 1777 that the plans for Burgoyne's advance came from Germain alone; and the latter replied with a definition of his functions:

Affairs of such importance [he wrote] receive the fullest consideration from his Majesty's principal servants, and they are then submitted, with their humble opinion, to the King, who, after mature deliberation, gives such commands as his Majesty judges most proper. The executing such orders belongs to my department, and if the manner of conveying them is improper, I stand alone responsible for it. The last letter [that appointing Burgoyne, and arranging] the disposition of the forces in Canada, however displeasing it may have been to you, was particularly directed by the King, after his Majesty had taken into consideration every information which could be furnished from the Secretary's office or from the report of General Burgoyne, so that all my business consisted in putting his Majesty's commands into the form of a dispatch.<sup>33</sup>

The following year, when Lord Howe charged Germain with acting independently of the ministry, the American secretary denied the assertion which was, he said, so often made in the House, that the failure in the American war was solely imputable to himself. It was not his intention to skulk behind the throne, but fairly to stand forth responsible for his conduct; for whatever he did was with the advice and approval of the other branches of the administration. Lord North came to his assistance, denying that ministers were sheltering behind the king, and saying that if censure was due to Lord George, he would himself lay claim to part of it for "measures of state, originating in the King's counsels, and . . . no more the noble lord's measures than they were of any other member of the Cabinet".<sup>34</sup> It is probably true that the blame for failure in this campaign should fall less upon Germain and more upon the king than has often been assumed. The ministers could not admit in Parliament that in fact the king was directing his own policy, and in proportion as they misses Shelburne's story, and it is to be regretted that Philip Guedalla (*Fathers of the Revolution*), in apparent ignorance of the Knox Manuscripts and of Egerton's standard work, perpetuates the legend.

The whole affair is wrapped in obscurity because both accounts are undated; in neither instance is it clear to what letters they refer. Germain evidently contented himself with a slovenly manner of instructing Howe, and his negligence does not appear much the less if it is assumed that Howe's participation was not essential.

<sup>33</sup> Knox MSS., in *Various Collections*, VI. 132; cf. also p. 145, where Germain sends Knox the draft of a letter to the commissioners in America with the note that he wishes Suffolk, Sandwich, "and in short all the Cabinet if possible" to see it before he signs it.—The attempted resignation of Bathurst in February, 1778, was due to his not being consulted about Germain's letter to Howe, the letter being read to the rest of the Cabinet. Hist. MSS. Comm., *Report on Bathurst MSS.*, pp. 17-18; Donne, *op. cit.*, II. 133-136.

<sup>34</sup> *Parliamentary History*, 1778-1780, pp. 73-80.

were hard pressed, so they were compelled to disavow any such dependence upon irresponsible authority. Germain himself however came dangerously near to such an admission in November, 1778, and Fox, ever ready for his opportunity, immediately forced him to declare explicitly that the king could act only on ministerial advice and responsibility.<sup>35</sup>

Germain clearly felt the failure of Saratoga very deeply. He had anticipated success with that ill-founded optimism that usually accompanied his plans. "If [Burgoyne's] army", he had told Knox in July, "is not able to defeat any force that the rebels can oppose to it, we must give up the contest."<sup>36</sup> Thus its complete failure plunged the minister into gloom and discontent, and the increase of influence that it gave to his more conciliatory colleagues further disheartened the advocate of coercion.

In January, 1778, his wife died, and for a while it seemed that the widower might remain in the private life to which for a time he retired.

I really feel [he wrote to Knox] so little able to return to the business with the activity that our present situation requires that I should act unfairly by those with whom I have served if I did not wish and advise their adopting the best measures for the publick service. I do foresee there may be difficulties in prevailing upon any proper person to undertake so responsible an office in such times; all I can say to that is, that when I came in there was as little appearance of success, and as I never had any view but the giving every assistance in my power, so that if my being permitted to retire answers any publick end I shall rejoice in having proposed it. A man at my time of life, depress'd by misfortunes, will make but a bad figure in an office that requires full vigour of mind, activity and diligence.<sup>37</sup>

Lord Suffolk urged that such a change would be against the public interest. "We can't go far without your assistance", he told Germain. "We may make some little progress, but the execution must depend upon you."<sup>38</sup> Accordingly Germain soon returned to his office, but for several months he was evidently weary and discontented there. Rumors of a Franco-American alliance were active, and with them came demands for a new peace negotiation. It was even reported that Chatham and Shelburne were to return to power in the places of Germain and Suffolk.<sup>39</sup> About this time

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 1777-1778, p. 1374; Lord John Russell, *Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox*, I. 203.

<sup>36</sup> Knox MSS., in *Various Collections*, VI. 133.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 141-142.

<sup>38</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, II. 90.

<sup>39</sup> Vergennes to Gérard, Feb. 12(?), 1778. Archives des Affaires Étrangères, États Unis, III. 50, fo. 113 (Stevens's *Facsimiles*, no. 786).

Germain quarrelled with the Lord Chancellor;<sup>40</sup> and when finally Carleton, after writing with asperity to the unhappy minister, was honored with the government of Charlemont in Ireland, Lord George actually sent in his resignation. At first it seems to have been accepted. In spite of his many enemies, wrote the king to North, "I never would have recommended his removal unless with his own good-will; now he will save us all trouble".<sup>41</sup> Lord North, himself at this time anxious to retire, was surprised at the actual occasion of the step, although he believed that Germain had long intended to resign at the first favorable opportunity.<sup>42</sup>

It does not appear from what reason Germain was over-persuaded; but a few days after these remarks were set down he was once more carrying on the routine of his office, and interviewing the members of the Carlisle peace commission. For the future however in the absence of any other person at once willing and able to undertake his responsibilities, he remained uneasily waiting for a suitable means of withdrawing from power without the appearance of dismissal.<sup>43</sup> In May he again attempted to retire with the Wardenship of the Cinque Ports, pleading age and the fatigue of attendance at the House;<sup>44</sup> but it was not till 1782 that the opportunity of a peerage gave him his chance thus to preserve the appearance of royal favor.

The complete change in the military situation wrought by the failure at Saratoga and the approaching French alliance with America again pushed forward plans for conciliation. In their early stages North seems once more to have acted independently of the American Office. "This whole measure of conciliation", Germain wrote to a friend on February 3, "the choice of commissioners, etc., has been carried on not only without consulting with me, but without the smallest degree of communication."<sup>45</sup> A few days later he was discussing the plan with the king, to whom he advocated a policy different from that of North.<sup>46</sup> It was the Declaratory Act, he said, which was most galling to the Americans; and though a wrong impression might be given by repealing it specifically, the same end could be gained by cancelling all the offensive measures passed since 1763. This policy

<sup>40</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, I. 139, II. 93.

<sup>41</sup> *Donne, op. cit.*, II. 141.

<sup>42</sup> North to Eden, Mar. 3(?), 1778. *Auckland MSS.* in King's College, Cambridge (*Stevens's Facsimiles*, no. 387).

<sup>43</sup> Smith to Eden, May-August, 1778. *Ibid.*, no. 513.

<sup>44</sup> *Hist. MSS. Comm., Tenth Report*, Appendix VI. 22 (*Abergavenny MSS.*); *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, I. 73.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 139.

<sup>46</sup> *Donne, op. cit.*, II. 131.

would either drive France openly to the American side, or would prevent the Americans from accepting such an alliance. It is characteristic of Germain that whilst quite unable even to guess which effect was the more likely, he yet advocated a scheme which would precipitate definite action.

For the failure of the Carlisle peace mission Germain was no more responsible than for its initiation; and in the meantime he was suggesting to Clinton an active prosecution of the war on different lines by giving more attention to Canada and to Georgia.<sup>47</sup> The resulting campaigns in the South ending with the surrender of Yorktown in 1781 form a subject for special study. In so far however as it is possible to justify or condemn the military schemes of a minister apart from modifications introduced by the character and ability of their instruments, some comment may be made upon Germain's general policy.

Throughout his period of office, called in, as he was, to direct the plan of coercion, he clearly regarded himself as called also to direct operations in detail; and it well suited his ingenious and confident temperament to control military dispositions from Whitehall. Only too late did he realize how hard it was to grasp the local difficulties and make the changes necessary to apply an English scheme to the American continent. Carleton vainly expressed the hope that the defeat at Saratoga would "prevent ministers from pretending to direct operations of war in a country at three thousand miles' distance, of which they have so little knowledge as not to be able to distinguish between good, bad, or interested advice, or to give positive orders upon matters which from their nature are ever on the change".<sup>48</sup> Only by having on the American side a commander-in-chief with full power to modify ministerial instructions could success in such intricate co-ordination as that of the triple convergence on Albany be insured. In fact Germain's habit of giving minute and rigid instructions to the British generals irritated them almost as much as his inability to provide them with reinforcements urgently needed, and he made matters worse by misrepresenting the situation which they knew only too well, in order to persuade himself and them that *his* plan was still practicable. "For God's sake, my Lord", wrote Clinton in 1779, "if you wish me to do anything, leave me to myself, and let me adapt my efforts to the hourly change of circumstances."<sup>49</sup> Then when friction began to obstruct the smooth working of their connection Germain did more harm by

<sup>47</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, II. 94-99; *Stevens's Facsimiles*, no. 1062.

<sup>48</sup> Carleton to Burgoyne, Nov. 17, 1777; Fortescue, *op. cit.*, III. 242.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 280.

communicating directly with subordinate officers, notably under Carleton and Clinton, in such a way as to destroy that self-confidence and consciousness of power which, if dangerous in an American secretary, was most desirable in a commander-in-chief. It can hardly be a mere coincidence that Germain was successively on bad terms with Carleton, the Howes, Burgoyne, and Clinton.

The plans laid in Whitehall were not only badly executed. They were also weak in themselves; and for this Germain may or may not be held responsible according to the opinion of the critic. He insisted throughout upon frequent diversions and dispersions of the regular troops, when the generals at the head could see that they were thus courting disaster. But Germain did not demand this policy from sheer stupidity, and the key to his conduct is found in various remarks made between 1779 and 1781.

He apparently believed that it was impossible to subdue America with a royal army. What he hoped for was to win back from the tyranny of Congress those Loyalists whom he believed to number half the population. On the practicability of this policy he constantly insisted.<sup>50</sup> "Our utmost efforts", he wrote to Clinton in 1779,<sup>51</sup> "will fail of their effect if we cannot find means to engage the people of America in support of a cause which is equally their own and ours"; and in 1781 he declared in Parliament that he had never been so sanguine as to believe that America could be reduced to obedience by force of arms. All that he had ever believed and that he had ever wished for was to give efficacy to the struggle of the Loyalists against the rebels.<sup>52</sup> This limited aim was no doubt more evident after defeat; but there is no reason to question his statement in essence. From the very beginning, in spite of temperamental exuberances, he had had misgivings. From the beginning also he had dwelt overmuch upon the great body of loyalism which he regarded as suppressed precariously by the fanatic Congress.

In its practical application however it was most unfortunate that British policy should have been dictated by the attempt to rally Loyalists. The effective force was so weakened by division in otherwise legitimate diversions that the army never gained a measure of success big enough to attract the men for whose support a bid was being made. In short, Germain showed a lack of that judgment which was needed to find the mean between campaigns concentrated entirely at one point and divisions so weakening as to prevent success at all.

<sup>50</sup> *Parliamentary History*, 1780-1781, pp. 581, 830-839.

<sup>51</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, II. 135.

<sup>52</sup> *Parliamentary History*, 1780-1781, p. 725.



The Southern campaigns show the evils of the whole system. Germain—as also the king—was persuaded that operations in the South, even at the risk of abandoning New England, would attract Loyalists and possibly preserve half if not all the rebel territory. With forces divided between Canada, New York, and the South; with a command held more and more discontentedly by Clinton, and in fact only shared with his subordinate Cornwallis; and without that supremacy at sea which should have been the first consideration for any wide-ranging dispersion of troops, Yorktown was, if not the inevitable, at least a highly probable outcome.

If any confirmation were needed of such generalizations based upon American operations it could be obtained from the campaigns in the West Indies.<sup>53</sup> Here there were at times commanders courageous enough to flout instructions to disperse, and thus defeat was staved off for awhile; but those instructions were given, and were in part responsible for the failure which followed in the islands. Rodney was able to salvage something from the wreckage, but no success in this region can be credited to Germain, and far from contradicting his American failure, his West Indian campaigns only add another to it.

After Yorktown it was necessary to reconsider the American situation; and in order to determine future policy the king directed Germain to submit a scheme for the special consideration of each member of the Cabinet.<sup>54</sup> In this memorandum the minister, who still refused to admit any need for conceding independence, although he appears to have regarded Yorktown as the deathblow to his hopes,<sup>55</sup> dwelt on the danger of abandoning the colonies, as France would reap the reward, possibly gaining both Canada and the West Indies. He recommended the adoption at least of an active naval policy, and also the appointment of a new commander-in-chief with complete power to negotiate terms of peace. Too late he seems to have realized the weakness which experience should have made patent long before. But before any such plan could be put into operation, the American secretary had fallen, and, soon afterwards, the long-lived North ministry.

Lord George Germain's resignation of the American seals in 1782 is less surprising than his ability to retain them for six and a half years, when the extent and bitterness of his unpopularity is considered; and no superficial explanation can account for such longevity in the position second only to that of North in importance.

<sup>53</sup> Fortescue, *op. cit.*, vol. III., chs. XIII., XV., XVII., XVIII.

<sup>54</sup> Donne, *op. cit.*, II. 392; *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, II. 216-220.

<sup>55</sup> N. Wraxall, *Historical Memoirs of My Own Time*, p. 400.

His bad relations with the military leaders have been alluded to. His rancor against Carleton was notorious; Sir William Howe resigned in disgust at the lack of confidence and consideration shown him; and it was with difficulty that the king himself smoothed over a possible crisis before the arrival of the new commander, so curtly did Germain write to Howe.<sup>56</sup> Clinton was not long in reaching the same position, alluding bitterly to the minister's "unaccountable" conduct and unexampled treatment of him.<sup>57</sup> The West Indies could be cited as another sparring-ground for Lord George and his generals. That the fault in most cases was distributed on both sides is beside the question.

In Parliament Germain was from the beginning singled out for especial attack. In 1777 Fox declared that the time when he had "forced himself into administration" and begun to "dictate measures to the ministry" was the first step in the descent to failure; a little later he followed this up with the accusation that Lord George was "solely responsible" for the lamentable situation.<sup>58</sup> Early the following year Sir Alexander Leith made a personal attack on Germain's character and incapacity, with scarcely veiled allusions to Minden;<sup>59</sup> and a few months later, in a debate dealing with Saratoga, Temple Luttrell made so violent an onslaught on the character of the minister that it was only with great difficulty and after more than two hours of altercation that a duel was avoided.<sup>60</sup> In March, 1779, a milder and more polite offensive was unsuccessfully attempted by questioning Germain's constitutional right, as a third Secretary of State, to sit in the House of Commons.<sup>61</sup> Again the same year he was singled out by Fox and others; and Lord Dartmouth, who was by no means in agreement with Germain, commented on the "unjust attacks . . . from the men who have had the most respect and attention paid to them".<sup>62</sup> In 1780 Burke's Establishment Bill for abolishing, among other offices, that of the American secretary, made a second attack from the constitutional side;<sup>63</sup> and

<sup>56</sup> Donne, *op. cit.*, II. 116-119, 133-136; Hist. MSS. Comm., *Report on Bathurst MSS.*, p. 18.

<sup>57</sup> Clinton to Eden, Dec. 7, 1781, Auckland MSS. in King's College, Cambridge (Stevens's *Facsimiles*, no. 751); E. Stuart-Wortley, *A Prime Minister and his Son*, p. 133.

<sup>58</sup> *Parliamentary History*, 1777-1778, pp. 433, 533.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 700.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1199-1203; Smith to Eden, May-August, 1778, Auckland MSS. in King's College, Cambridge (Stevens's *Facsimiles*, no. 513).

<sup>61</sup> *Parliamentary History*, 1778-1780, pp. 250-269.

<sup>62</sup> Knox MSS., in *Various Collections*, VI. 164.

<sup>63</sup> *Parliamentary History*, 1778-1780, p. 194.

finally, towards the end of the same year, Fox descended again to personal abuse and in a debate on Palliser's promotion introduced quite irrelevant allusions to Germain's public degradation.<sup>64</sup> The twenty-year-old Ghost of Minden was still very much alive.

Attacks from a Parliamentary opposition were however to be expected; and even animosities between a minister and his generals in the field are not unusual after notably unsuccessful campaigns. More serious were the jealousies and divisions within the Cabinet; and Germain's political career is one long catalogue of these.

He had not taken up the seals of office in 1775 before the first of these discords was sounded by the attempt of Suffolk and William Eden, his under-secretary, to keep the third secretaryship of state subordinate to the other two.<sup>65</sup> Three months later he was the centre of the Cabinet disagreement which arose over the instructions to the Howe peace mission of 1776; and all but resigned his office.<sup>66</sup> In 1777 his personal animosities obliged the king to intrigue against him to the extent of arranging for Cabinet opposition to his proposal for Carleton's recall, and of drawing from an under-secretary information about the minister's letters to Howe; whilst more irritation was growing in the same quarter through Germain's unreliability as a representative of the ministry in the House, both by remaining silent when he should have spoken and by saying the wrong thing when he did emerge.<sup>67</sup>

In 1778 Lord Bathurst was removed from the chancellorship, and Lord Barrington from the War Office; and in both instances incompatibility with the American secretary, personal or political, had important if vague influence.<sup>68</sup> The prospect of Germain's own resignation earlier in the year was looked upon by the king as a "most favourable event", because of the many enemies he had made;<sup>69</sup> and a casual remark made to Knox by his superior throws some light on the relations between Lord George and his colleagues. Sending some suggestions to North through Knox, Germain added: "If he adopts them they may be of use; if they come only from me I know their fate."<sup>70</sup> Almost at the same time Eden, now dis-

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 830-839.

<sup>65</sup> A. H. Basye, "The Secretary of State for the Colonies, 1768-1782", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVIII. 13-23.

<sup>66</sup> *Supra*, p. 27.

<sup>67</sup> Donne, *op. cit.*, II. 55, 116-118, 130, 246-248, etc.

<sup>68</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, II. 93; *Bathurst MSS.*, p. viii; Eden to North, Sept. 13, 1778, Auckland MSS. in King's College, Cambridge (*Stevens's Facsimiles*, no. 853).

<sup>69</sup> Donne, *op. cit.*, II. 141.

<sup>70</sup> Knox MSS., in *Various Collections*, VI. 155.

grunted as a result of the unsuccessful Carlisle mission, was writing to Wedderburn that Germain had "contrived to lose the esteem and reliance of every description of men civil or military, who are to serve with him or under him".<sup>71</sup> Such divisions naturally had their effect on North and although, like the king, he saw through Eden's schemes to drive Germain out of office he nevertheless proposed that a peerage for the unpopular secretary might solve the difficulty. The king refused this suggestion on the ground that Germain did not deserve it.<sup>72</sup>

When in July, 1779, the northern secretaryship fell vacant, party negotiations for a new appointment revealed a widespread desire to remove both Germain and Sandwich;<sup>73</sup> and although for the time no change was made in either office, the American minister was soon drawn more closely into the rearrangements. The Bedford section of the ministry, led by Gower, had grown so restive that North deemed it wise to placate them by bringing Carlisle, one of their leaders, into the Cabinet.<sup>74</sup> At the king's suggestion therefore North broached to Germain a proposal to separate the Board of Trade from the American office, and give the presidency of it to Carlisle. The king instructed North at the same time to prevent Germain seeking refuge in the hope of promotion to the Upper House. Lord George accepted the scheme reluctantly, feeling, in spite of North's assurance, that it was degrading to his office, and asking rather that Carlisle take over his whole position, especially as advancing age would not long spare him the energy needed for such arduous duties. At the same time he feared that by bringing into ministerial office the representative of an unsuccessful attempt at conciliation, the government might appear to be weakening in its determination to prosecute the war. North, without the possibility of sweetening the pill, found it difficult to answer this reproachful submission; but, spurred on by the king, assured him that no degradation was intended, and sought to console by pointing to his own unsuccessful attempts to leave office.

By the Parliamentary sessions of 1780 and 1781 the unpopularity of Germain reached an extent alarming to ministerial hopes.<sup>75</sup> When

<sup>71</sup> Eden to Wedderburn, Jan. 17, 1779. Auckland MSS. in King's College, Cambridge (Stevens's *Facsimiles*, no. 552).

<sup>72</sup> Donne, *op. cit.*, II. 226, 255.

<sup>73</sup> Knox MSS., in *Various Collections*, VI. 261.

<sup>74</sup> A. H. Basye, *The Board of Trade, 1748-1782* (Yale University Press, 1925), ch. V.; *id.*, "The Earl of Carlisle and the Board of Trade, 1779", in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXII. 334-339; *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, II. 138-141; Donne, *op. cit.*, II. 282-283.

<sup>75</sup> Hist. MSS. Comm., *Tenth Report*, Appendix VI. 25 (*Abergavenny MSS.*).

Burke's Establishment Bill came up, involving the abolition of the American secretaryship, the king feared greatly that Lord George's withdrawal would seem so desirable that his own party would allow the bill to pass.<sup>76</sup> Lord Pembroke was giving Germain as the reason for his retirement shortly before.<sup>77</sup> At the end of 1781 Dundas was threatening to resign with the same excuse, and with Rigby was heading the opposition to Germain within the party itself;<sup>78</sup> whilst at the same time the American minister's long-standing quarrel with Sandwich became so violent that Fox declared he would regard him as a principal witness when the First Lord was impeached.<sup>79</sup>

By December, 1781, the failure at Yorktown, the question of a new American policy, and the attacks upon Germain had made it likely that important ministerial changes would have to come. An increasingly widespread opinion, especially among the country gentlemen, favored at least a strict limitation of coercion to a purely naval offensive, or else a new negotiation with America. Germain continued to stand firm for no surrender to the claim of independence, and was made the object of determined attacks led by Rigby and Dundas;<sup>80</sup> whilst it was popularly believed that North himself had come to favor the cessation of hostilities. Like the Whigs of six years earlier, Rigby and the Bedford group charged the first minister with being overruled by Germain, and the unfortunate North was reduced to his wits' end, under which circumstances he took his usual refuge in doing nothing, much to the anxiety of all concerned.

Lord George expressed his own opinions to his friend Irwin three days before Christmas:

I was in hopes [he wrote] some arrangement would have taken place, and that I should have been released from the very unpleasant situation in which I find myself. I have said all that was possible to the King upon this subject, but hitherto it has produced no effect. It would be highly unbecoming to fly from any attack that may be made, so that I must hold on till his Majesty can see it for his interest to change hands. If the Admiralty and my department were held out to some parts of Opposition, I should think the hands of government might be strengthened. I begin to fear the adjournment will pass off without doing any thing. However I shall have nothing to reproach myself with, for I have spoke with a freedom which few masters but ours would approve of.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>76</sup> Donne, *op. cit.*, II. 310.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 303.

<sup>78</sup> Walpole, *Last Journals*, II. 396.

<sup>79</sup> *Carlisle MSS.*, p. 542; Lord John Russell, *Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox*, I. 268.

<sup>80</sup> Knox MSS., in *Various Collections*, VI. 272.

<sup>81</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, I. 140-141.

Meanwhile the king had been considering Germain's memorandum on the future conduct of the war, and had reached the conclusion that if his suggestion of a new commander-in-chief were to be adopted, every indication pointed to General Carleton. It was equally clear that Carleton and Germain could not work together; and in the political confusion it seemed more appropriate that the minister should be the one to go, which he was willing to do if only it did not appear as a dismissal.<sup>82</sup> The king did not wish to disown Germain's policy, with which he was himself in essential agreement; but if he were given a peerage and Carleton appointed to the command, the personal reasons for his retirement would be obvious, and no change of policy need be ascribed to the king. On December 26, therefore, North was requested to sound a possible successor for the American office. He retired to Bushey, and for a fortnight all was quiet. The king told Germain that the appointment to supersede Clinton was bound up with other matters, and accepted the minister's suggestion that he withdraw to the country to await further developments.<sup>83</sup>

Lord North was evidently both puzzled and distressed. He enquired of Knox what had suggested to Germain that changes were being considered. What was needed, he declared, was a change of measures not of men. Finally Germain, growing impatient after three weeks' delay, sent to the king the definite question, whether he was still in office or not. The king, placed in an awkward position, asked if he wished to stay; whereupon Germain replied that if the war was to be carried on with vigor and the idea of independence rejected, he was ready to stay, but that he could not retract anything he had said on those questions, and would not remain unless supported by his colleagues.<sup>84</sup>

The king represented to North the difficulty that his delay was causing, and on January 19 Lord George was summoned to meet the chief minister. Whether by chance or design he was not given an opportunity to speak privately with him, and came away in a great passion, again appealing to the king to know when he should deliver up the seals of office. Another royal request caused North to act, and the two ministers met on the twenty-second for a final decision. It was impossible, said North, to recover America now, and nothing but independence was practicable. Germain refused to accept this

<sup>82</sup> Donne, *op. cit.*, II. 396-403.

<sup>83</sup> Knox MSS., in *Various Collections*, VI. 181, 272.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 272; Donne, *op. cit.*, II. 402; Knox to Eden, Feb. 1, 1782, Auckland MSS. in King's College, Cambridge (Stevens's *Facsimiles*, no. 1051).



view, and at a later interview with the king he was informed that on the question of sovereignty their attitude was the same.<sup>85</sup>

North's dilemma can be imagined. On the one hand he heard the clamor for Germain's removal, inside the ministry and out. On the other he saw the king in closer agreement on policy with his subordinate than with himself, although personally in favor of a change. He tried at first to get Germain to resign without the suggestion that he himself or the king desired it. Germain, however, was unwilling to retire in this way, whilst he could plead the king's service as his reason. He therefore appealed to North to decide quickly whether he was to go or stay. The need of a definite ministerial policy was rendered urgent by the condition of public affairs; and, he wrote, "I should think myself inexcusable if I did not in the strongest terms again beseech your Lordship to dispose of me in that manner which may best answer your lordship's views for his Majesty's service and the public good".<sup>86</sup> Small wonder that in such circumstances Lord George should have "lost the only good part of his speaking—his arrogance and presumption".<sup>87</sup>

Finally after a month of suspense and pressure from his colleagues North offered the American department to Jenkinson, who firmly refused it. An alternative successor was found in Welbore Ellis, and as soon as North had thus taken definite action Germain prepared to withdraw to his now promised peerage.<sup>88</sup> In consultation with the king he fixed the date for his resignation, and on February 8 he took his seat in the Upper House as Viscount Sackville.

It was hardly necessary by a change of title to remind the peers that their new member was the notorious Lord George Sackville of twenty years before; and when he entered the House of Lords the Ghost of Minden entered with him. On the first news of his elevation Lord Abingdon expressed his opinion in terms of unqualified abuse rivalling that of any commoner. Responsible for all the calamities and distresses which England groaned under, his blood-thirstiness, his weakness, his wickedness, and his mismanagement of the war far exceeded in guilt his disobedience to a commanding officer, and made him, Abingdon declared, the greatest criminal this country had ever seen. A protest against Sackville's admission was

<sup>85</sup> Knox MSS., in *Various Collections*, VI. 272, 276. North appears to have told Germain that there was no objection to him personally, but that his stand against independence made the difficulty, "and yet", he added, "your being out of the way won't mend matters for the King is of the same opinion".

<sup>86</sup> *Stopford-Sackville MSS.*, I. 77; *Hist. MSS. Comm., Tenth Report*, Appendix VI. 48 (*Abergavenny MSS.*).

<sup>87</sup> *Carlisle MSS.*, p. 561.

<sup>88</sup> Donne, *op. cit.*, II. 404-405.

actually signed by a small minority which included Rutland, Pembroke, and Chatham; but assistance came from an unexpected quarter. Lord Shelburne, a friend of the Great Commoner who had been offended by Sackville's return to the Council table, now performed a volte-face, and, a week after denouncing the appointment of such a man to the ministry as a gross insult to the Americans, now declared that the new viscount had held a more manly style of language than any other minister, and had uniformly acted with the nicest feelings, the strictest honor, the most unimpeachable integrity, and the most distinguished abilities.<sup>89</sup>

It is perhaps not far from the truth thus to summarize Germain's career as Secretary of State: he was brought into office as a man of outstanding ability at a time when the ministry was notably lacking in such men; and as a determined advocate of a definite policy of coercion, when the principal ministers felt the need of a leader and could not take such a policy upon themselves. Fortune and temperament however were alike against him. His ill-balanced disposition and his resentment of criticism made him totally unfit to conceive and direct large schemes based on a broad statesmanlike outlook; and the unfortunate scandal of his military career led to opposition and personal animosities which were increased by his quick temper and thwarted ambitions. In the face of greater difficulties than have usually been recognized he was seen to be unsuccessful; and the great speculation of his appointment was seen to be a failure. "He has not been of use in his department", wrote the king to Lord North, "and nothing but the most meritorious services could have wiped off his former misfortunes."<sup>90</sup>

In spite of this, he was not encouraged to resign, probably because it seemed difficult to find as good a minister as himself willing to serve in the court party, and because he was so closely associated with the policy of coercion that he could hardly be dismissed without that policy being disowned, especially since North was suspected of being lukewarm in its support. Thus he remained in office until the king overcame a personal reluctance to procure with a peerage his honorable retirement.

It is an interesting commentary upon the importance of personal attachment to the king that three of the ministers most closely associated with the American war—North, Germain, and Barrington—were kept in office in spite of repeated attempts to resign; and that on American affairs only one of the three held opinions coincident with those of the king. Barrington was induced to administer the

<sup>89</sup> *Parliamentary History*, 1781-1782, pp. 999-1022.

<sup>90</sup> Donne, *op. cit.*, II. 255.

War Office for three years after he had expressed disagreement with the idea of coercion. North, by similar means, was forced to remain in an irksome situation when he was willing to concede much of theoretical sovereignty in the cause of peace. Germain on the other hand believed firmly in the policy he tried to carry out; and it was not to signalize any change of principle that he withdrew. Anxious to retire, he refused to become a scapegoat. If American independence were recognized he would immediately resign; but having the firm support of his sovereign on this matter he declined to be thrown a victim to his enemies in the Cabinet. A peerage however was sufficient mark of royal favor, and with it he retired. The policy of coercion, in which he alone of all the ministers supported the king with more than the convictions of a time-server, remained now without anyone to direct it. North, who continued to bear official responsibility for an attitude which refused to recognize Independence, had lost faith in the cause he represented. Well could Germain take his leave in the words which Horace Walpole ascribes to him: "You say I am to go, my Lord;—very well;—but why pray is your Lordship to stay?"<sup>91</sup>

GEORGE H. GUTTRIDGE.

<sup>91</sup> Walpole, *Last Journals*, II. 396.

## AMERICAN INTEREST IN THE GREEK CAUSE, 1821-1827<sup>1</sup>

WHEN the Greeks of the Morea rose in 1821 to throw off an Ottoman rule of four centuries, their cause promptly claimed the sympathy of Americans. With their own Revolution fresh in mind, Americans were not indifferent to the fate of another people struggling for emancipation from an oppressive imperialism. Republicans were aroused on behalf of a Greek nation which aspired to establish liberal and representative institutions. Christians applauded the rising of Christian Greeks against Moslem Turks. Merchants admired this Mediterranean people which, in the face of Ottoman displeasure, had built a thriving commerce and a formidable naval power. Humanitarians were stirred by the sufferings of a helpless Greek population which found itself homeless, naked, and hungry, in the bitter and cruel war of extermination which followed the first military operations. The clergy were shocked by the execution of the venerable Greek patriarch Gregorios, who was hanged in his sacred robes on Easter Sunday, 1821, and whose body was delivered to the Jews to be dragged through the streets of Constantinople and unceremoniously thrown into the Bosphorus. Americans regardless of creed or station were horrified by the devastation of the island of Chios, in April, 1822, when hungry Ottoman vengeance was reputed to have put twenty-seven thousand Greeks to the sword and to have sold forty-three thousand more into slavery.

Any of these considerations would have been sufficient to focus American eyes on the Peloponnesus, to stir American hearts to compassion, and to open American purses to the innocent victims of revolution and war. But none of them adequately explains American interest in the Greek cause. The uprising of the Serbians against the Turks between 1807 and 1817 had created hardly a ripple on the surface of public opinion in the United States. The Serbs, like the Greeks, were struggling to be free, were asserting a natural right to determine their own destiny, were Christians waging a crusade of liberation from Islam. They, too, had felt the cruel hand of Ottoman military "pacification"; their homes had been destroyed and their women and children carried into slavery. In so far as it received any attention at all, however, the Serbian War of

<sup>1</sup> Parts of this article were read as a paper at the Rochester meeting of the American Historical Association in December, 1926.

Independence was viewed as an uprising of a semi-barbarous Balkan peasantry. Why did the Serb cause create no passionate attachments in America? Was it solely because of the preoccupation of Americans with affairs of greater moment? Or was it because the Serbs were not possessed of a great name?

All educated men in America had sat in reverence at the feet of the ancient Greeks. They saw in the inhabitants of the Peloponnesus and the Aegean islands in 1821 not a simple, well-intentioned, illiterate body of peasantry and seamen and brigands, but the lineal descendants of the ancient Hellenes, heirs to the traditions of Pericles, Plato, Demosthenes, and Homer. As such, the modern Greeks were entitled to the aid of all Western civilization, which owed to their Hellenic forefathers most of what it cherished in the arts, philosophy, literature, and the science of government. It was to be expected "that the reappearance of those people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should produce that excitement and sympathy in their favor which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States".<sup>2</sup> The sentiment of Philhellenism had taken hold in America as in Europe.

### I.

In May, 1821, almost immediately after the outbreak of the Greek insurrection, the Messenian Senate of Calamata addressed an appeal to the citizens of the United States, asking in the name of liberty and Christianity that assistance be rendered "to purge Greece from the barbarians, who for four hundred years have polluted the soil". It was pointed out that insurrectionary Greece was but following the example of revolutionary America of fifty years before. Greeks and Americans, therefore, are by nature "friends, fellow-citizens, and brethren"; Greece regards the United States as "nearer than the nations on our frontiers". The interests of the two countries "are of a nature more and more to cement an alliance founded on freedom and virtue". Americans assuredly will not "imitate the culpable indifference or rather the long ingratitude of some of the Europeans. No, the fellow-citizens of Penn, of Washington, and of Franklin will not refuse their aid to the descendants of Phocion and Thrasybulus, of Aratus, and of Philopoemen".<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Annual message of President Monroe, Dec. 3, 1822. Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, II. 193.

<sup>3</sup> The full text of the appeal will be most conveniently found in English translation in the *North American Review*, XVII. (Boston, 1823) 415-416. A French version may be found in Driault and Lhéritier, *Histoire Diplomatique de la Grèce de 1821 à Nos Jours*, I. (Paris, 1925) 170-171.

This appeal was forwarded to the Greek committee in Paris, whence it was despatched to the United States. Albert Gallatin mailed the Greek text and a French translation to John Quincy Adams from Paris in September, 1821, and at about the same time Adamantios Koraës, the famous Greek patriot and scholar, sent a copy to Edward Everett, professor of Greek at Harvard and editor of the *North American Review*.<sup>4</sup> The document was printed and distributed widely throughout the United States and was the basis of appeals made on behalf of the Greek cause. It pleased Americans to learn how spontaneously Greece turned to the United States as the exemplar of civil and religious liberty. According to Edward Everett, "such an appeal from the anxious conclave of self-devoted patriots, in the inaccessible cliffs of the Morea, must bring home to the mind of the least reflecting American, the great and glorious part, which this country is to act, in the political regeneration of the world".<sup>5</sup>

During the years 1821 and 1822, however, little was done in the United States on behalf of the Greek cause. President Monroe's message of December, 1822, spoke sympathetically of Greece and wished the Greek nation God-speed on its road to independence, but there was no hint of definite American assistance to that end. At about the same time an enthusiastic meeting at Albany, New York, launched a nation-wide campaign to arouse public sentiment in favor of Greece and to solicit funds for the prosecution of the war; to this end "circulars were addressed by the general corresponding committee [appointed by the meeting], and forwarded through the mail to distinguished and influential men at Washington, to the governors of the different states, and to the chief magistrates of the principal cities and towns of our own and other states who were supposed friendly to the cause of suffering humanity"; but it took time to produce results, and nothing was accomplished until much later.<sup>6</sup> December 24, 1822, Mr. Dwight of Massachusetts presented to the House of Representatives a memorial of the people of the District of Columbia on behalf of the Greek revolutionaries. But "the sentiment of the House was against meddling with the subject, and the memorial was ordered to lie on the table".<sup>7</sup>

This completes the record for 1822, except in one important respect—George Jarvis, a New Yorker then abroad, joined the Greek

<sup>4</sup> *Writings of Albert Gallatin*, ed. Henry Adams, II. 198; *North American Review*, XVII. 414.

<sup>5</sup> *North American Review*, XVII. 417.

<sup>6</sup> *Niles' Register*, XXIII. (1822) 215. Also *Albany Argus*, Dec. 16, 1823, giving a résumé of the work of the Albany Committee for the preceding year.

<sup>7</sup> *Annals of Congress*, 17 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 457 et seq.



forces and became the vanguard of a small group of American Philhellenes who were to serve with distinction throughout the Greek War of Independence. Jarvis rapidly attracted attention in Greece, became a lieutenant-general in the Greek forces, and gained the reputation of being "almost the only foreigner who uniformly conducted himself with prudence and correctness".<sup>8</sup>

Throughout the winter, spring, and summer of 1823 there was a perceptible decline in popular interest in the Greek cause, attributable principally to the existence in Greece of dissension among the leaders of the revolt, which resulted in a civil war no less cruel and destructive than the campaigns of the Turks. But in the autumn, when hope for the revolution was dwindling throughout Europe and America, Lord Byron arrived in Greece. Henceforth there could be little question of the strength of Philhellenism in the United States; in America as elsewhere Byron's dramatic self-sacrifice rendered the cause of Greek independence services which never can be repaid. The autumn and winter of 1823-1824 were a period in which sentiment for Greek independence reached a high point, strenuous efforts were put forth to render active assistance to the revolutionary forces, and serious consideration was given to a possible recognition of Greek belligerency and independence by the government of the United States.<sup>9</sup>

The clarion call of American Philhellenism was sounded by Edward Everett in the *North American Review* for October, 1823. In an article which attracted widespread attention and respect Everett outlined a course of action for all Americans who believed in the cause of freedom. He contended that the Greeks, by reason of a formal declaration of independence, the raising of armies and navies, the successful conduct of military and naval operations, and the organization of a system of government,<sup>10</sup> had established their rights as belligerents, if not, indeed, as an independent nation. That they had not been recognized by the powers of Europe was but to the eternal disgrace of reactionary diplomacy. But an American policy was clearly indicated by the precedent of the Spanish-American re-

<sup>8</sup> *Letters and Journals of Samuel Gridley Howe*, ed. L. E. Richards, I. (Boston, 1906) 28-29, hereinafter cited as *Howe*; see also William Miller, "The Journals of Finlay and Jarvis", in the *English Historical Review*, XLI. (1926) 514-525.

<sup>9</sup> The present paper is not concerned with the attitude of the government of the United States toward the War for Greek Independence. Concerning activities of the President, Congress, and the Department of State, see E. M. Earle, "Early American Policy concerning Ottoman Minorities", in the *Political Science Quarterly*, September, 1927.

<sup>10</sup> The text of the Greek constitution of January, 1822, was published as an appendix to the article, pp. 404-412.

publics. A commission of investigation should be sent to Greece aboard the ships of the American naval squadron in the Mediterranean "to ascertain the progress of the war and the degree of organization of the government". If they report, as they must, that Greece has separated herself from the Ottoman Empire, "then let the independence of Greece be acknowledged by the United States, and a minister sent to their government".

Americans in their private capacity, proceeded Everett, might render substantial services to the Greek cause: young men might flock to Greece, "as the same class of generous spirits did to this country, in the revolutionary war"; money might be raised and supplies of arms and ammunition forwarded; correspondence might be entered into with the Grecian authorities, "which will teach those who are now toiling and bleeding for freedom, that we prize the blessing too highly, not to aid them in attaining it". No pretext would justify apathy:

The experience of our own revolutionary war is so recent, that we ought to have felt (ere this) how precious would be any aid from a distant land, however insignificant in amount. Who does not know that there were times in our own revolutionary war when a few barrels of gunpowder, the large guns of a privateer, a cargo of flour, a supply of clothing, yea, a few hundred pairs of shoes, for feet that left in blood the tracks of their march, would have done essential service to the cause of suffering liberty. . . . America has done something for Greece. Our missionary societies have their envoys to the Grecian church, with supplies of Bibles and tracts for their benighted flocks. But in the present state of this unhappy people, this is not the only succor they require. They are laying the foundations of civil freedom, without which even the blessings of the Gospel will be extended to them in vain. . . . We would respectfully suggest to the enlarged and pious minds of those who direct the great work of missionary charity that at this moment, the cause of the Grecian church can in no way be so effectually served, as by contributions directed to the field of the great struggle. The war is emphatically a war of the crescent against the cross. . . . At this crisis the messenger of the gospel fraternity should come in other guise than the distributor of the word.<sup>11</sup>

At about the same time Thomas Jefferson was writing from Monticello to Koraës, in Paris, congratulating him upon his efforts to make available to the modern Greeks "the fine models of science left by their ancestors, to whom we also are all indebted for the lights which originally led ourselves out of Gothic darkness". Jefferson expressed his great interest in the attempts of Greece to establish a representative government and suggested that the consti-

<sup>11</sup> *North American Review*, XVII. 392-422. The occasion of the article was a review by Everett of a new edition of *The Ethics of Aristotle*, revised and edited by A. Koraës.

tutions of the several states and of the United States, "being in print and in every hand", might well be taken into consideration when the new nation should come to frame its permanent political institutions. Should any of Jefferson's suggestions, based upon the experience of America, prove to be of service to Greece, Koraës was urged to consider it "a tribute rendered to the names of your Homer, your Demosthenes, and the splendid constellation of sages and heroes, whose blood is still flowing in your veins, and whose merits are still resting, as a heavy debt, on the shoulders of the living, and the future races of men". Koraës was assured that "no people sympathize more feelingly than ours with the sufferings of your countrymen; none offer more sincere and ardent prayers to heaven for their success. And nothing indeed but the fundamental principle of our government, never to entangle us with the broils of Europe, could restrain our generous youth from taking some part in this holy cause".<sup>12</sup> John Adams wrote to the Greek Committee in New York, December 29, 1823, that his heart "beat in unison" with theirs and with the courageous hearts of the Greeks and that he would be glad to contribute his "mite" to this "virtuous work", to which he wished all success.<sup>13</sup> The third living ex-President of the United States, James Madison, seriously proposed to President Monroe and to Richard Rush, the American minister at London, that the Greeks be included in the contemplated Anglo-American declaration concerning independence of the Latin-American republics.<sup>14</sup> Had Madison's advice been accepted, the Monroe Doctrine would have been a very different sort of policy than it proved ultimately to be. But Monroe's famous message of December 2, 1823, confined itself in so far as Greece was concerned to a renewed expression of sympathy for the Greek cause and a prophecy that the Greek people would win emancipation from Ottoman rule.<sup>15</sup>

## II.

By December, 1823, a spirited campaign was under way throughout the country to arouse public sentiment in favor of the Greek cause, to raise funds for the aid of the revolutionaries, and to influence Congress in its deliberations. In New York the campaign was opened by the erection of a huge cross on Brooklyn Heights, with the inscription "sacred to the Greek cause", the cross being raised into place with the toast: "May the Grecian Cross be planted from

<sup>12</sup> *Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (ed. H. A. Washington), VII. 318.

<sup>13</sup> *Niles' Register*, XXV. (1824) 324.

<sup>14</sup> *Writings of James Madison* (ed. Gaillard Hunt), IX. 159.

<sup>15</sup> Richardson, *op. cit.*, II. 217.

village to village, and from steeple to steeple, until it rests on the Dome of St. Sophia."<sup>16</sup> Later at a "large and respectable meeting of citizens" a committee of seventy distinguished gentlemen, with William Bayard as chairman and Charles King as secretary, was appointed to solicit contributions, and another committee, headed by Chancellor Kent, was charged with the preparation of suitable resolutions for presentation to Congress. At Boston, Professor Everett was the moving spirit in the formation of a similar committee, of which Thomas L. Winthrop was chairman. The economist, editor, and publisher, Mathew Carey, was the secretary of the Greek committee of Philadelphia; Nicholas Biddle was a conspicuous member and patron. Governor DeWitt Clinton and other state officials accepted positions on the Albany committee, along with General Peter Gansevoort. At New Haven, Noah Webster presided at a meeting in favor of the Greeks. At Cincinnati, a Greek benefit concert was preceded by "a spirited and eloquent address" by General William Henry Harrison. As early as January 6, 1824, the *New York Commercial Advertiser* reported: "We cannot keep the record of the numerous meetings called in every part of the country, to procure aid for the Greek cause. It is sufficient to say that the feeling is universal. Meetings are called in every considerable village, and country clergymen are taking up collections to augment the fund."<sup>17</sup>

Few, if any, of the universities and colleges were immune to the contagion. Enthusiastic meetings were held at Yale, Columbia, Hamilton, the United States Military Academy, Brown, Andover Theological Seminary, and other institutions of learning; at Yale and at West Point the students raised five hundred dollars for the Greek cause, and at other colleges smaller amounts were contributed. The resolutions adopted at Columbia are typical of those voted at other institutions. At a meeting of the undergraduates held in the chapel on December 9, 1823, the president of the college presiding, it was

*Resolved*, That the Students of this Institution unite with their fellow citizens in the anxious wish that Greece may once more be free; and desire equally with them, to be of some assistance to her in her present glorious struggle. It may be thought unbecoming in persons of our age,

<sup>16</sup> *New York Evening Post*, Sept. 6, 1823.

<sup>17</sup> For a study of newspapers and magazines, upon which is based the following account of the activities of the various Philhellenic committees, I am indebted to Miss Myrtle Cline of Columbia University. Miss Cline has made available to me her notes on the *New York Evening Post*, the *New York Commercial Advertiser*, the *Albany Argus*, the *Boston Daily Advertiser*, the *Columbian Centinel*, the *Connecticut Courant*, the *National Intelligencer*, the *Philadelphia National Gazette*, and *Niles' Register*, all for the years 1821 to 1828.

and devoted, as we are, exclusively to study, to interfere in the politics of the day; but the present occasion, it is conceived, is one on which without fear of censure all ages and all classes may come forward. We indeed are peculiarly called upon; our daily studies bring to our recollection Greece in the period of her glory; and if we did not sympathize in their misfortunes, and rejoice that she has at length awakened from her long degradation, to a remembrance of what she once was, we should be strangers to those generous feelings which in youth it may be sometimes pardonable to carry to excess, but which to be devoid of, would be considered in the highest degree dishonorable to the enlightened and liberal mind.

*First Resolved*, That a Committee of eight be appointed, two from each class, for the purpose of receiving subscriptions, and that the sum thus collected be forwarded to the General Committee of this City.

*Second Resolved*, That a Committee of three be appointed for the purpose of raising a sum from the students to publish the articles which appeared in the *American* for the golden medal, the proceeds of sale thereof to be applied to the Grecian fund.<sup>18</sup>

The raising of funds speedily took on all the paraphernalia which we have recently come to associate with the "drive" for charitable purposes. Special benefit performances were given at the theatres; special sermons were preached and special collections taken up in the churches; prominent men debated public questions and charged an admission fee to be donated to the local Greek committees; merchants were persuaded to assign to Greek relief a percentage of their profits; objects of value were offered at public auction and sold at inflated prices; school children handed up their pennies; laborers gave up a day's wages; shipowners donated space on their ships for supplies destined for Greece; innumerable balls and fairs were held. By these and other means the New York committee alone was able to raise and remit to London by May, 1824, the sum of thirty-two thousand dollars, in the form of a draft on Baring Brothers.<sup>19</sup> By July an additional five thousand dollars had been collected in New York, and by December, 1824, the total donations equalled almost eight thousand pounds sterling. No figures appear to be available for the country as a whole during the year 1823-1824, but obviously a creditable showing was made. The London *Morning Chronicle* said that the eight thousand pounds of the New York committee was "a sum, be it known to the shame of the United Kingdom, almost as large as all the subscriptions which the Greek Committee have been able to obtain in this country after eighteen months' exertion".<sup>20</sup>

<sup>18</sup> The New York *Commercial Advertiser*, Dec. 12, 1823.

<sup>19</sup> See the New York *Commercial Advertiser*, May 3, 1824. The money was delivered to the Greek emissaries by Richard Rush. His letter of remittance and its acknowledgment by the Greeks are given *ibid.*, Aug. 3, 1824.

<sup>20</sup> New York *Evening Post*, Dec. 4, 1824.

It is of interest to note that the money thus made available was delivered outright to the Greek emissaries in London apparently without restrictions as to its use. Consequently it went to the purchase of military supplies and other essentials to the prosecution of the war. In addition to money, the various American committees shipped direct to Greece a miscellaneous collection of muskets, rifles, swords, small cannon, and medical supplies, some of which may have been of use. Later, the American committees were careful to confine their beneficence to the relief of the civilian population.

The Boston committee published and distributed widely an eighteen-page statement of "those circumstances and considerations, which seem to us to dictate to the American people the propriety of an earnest expression of their sympathy, and of a generous exertion of their benevolence, in the cause of the Greeks". This pamphlet—one of numbers published throughout the United States by the various local committees—is of value as indicating the historical origins of American interest in the oppressed minorities of the Ottoman Empire. A portion of the argument therein presented is objective and logical; the remainder, including an impassioned peroration, consists of an appeal to those emotions which are most likely to produce generous financial contributions. There is, to begin with, a clear statement of the reasons underlying the revolution in Greece: the development of a Greek middle class and a Greek merchant marine; travel and education in Europe of Greek seamen, merchants, and students; the obvious anachronism of continued Ottoman rule over a people whose economic and cultural status was undergoing fundamental change; the intolerable character of the Turkish occupation of Greece, consisting, as it did, of domination by a race alien to the Greeks in language, religion, and political tradition; the backwardness, incompetence, and corruption of the Sultan's government. Against an intolerable despotism the Greeks finally "rose in their desperation, and appealed to arms, to Christian nations, and to God. They rose in the simple energy of oppressed, insulted, outraged man; their great resource that they had nothing more to lose; their strong encouragement that no extremity could sink them lower". Following this statement of the causes of the Greek revolt, there is a lengthy recital of Turkish atrocities committed since the outbreak of hostilities—barbarous conduct on the part of the Janissaries, the hanging of the Patriarch, the massacre and devastation committed at Chios, and the destruction of Christian villages and churches on the island of Cyprus. To stand unmoved in the presence of these outrages would be false to every American tradition; hence the members of the Boston committee "confidently call



upon the citizens of Boston and our brethren generally throughout the state, to join the efforts already made and making in the civilized world, for the relief of an oppressed, suffering, agonizing Christian people”:

We call upon our merchants, whose hearts are as noble as their fortunes, to put forth their liberality in behalf of an enterprising nation, which has not enjoyed the blessings of a government able and willing to protect their flag on every sea; but which, nevertheless, amidst indignity, insecurity, and oppression, has acquired a high reputation for commercial skill and industry. . . . We would invite the matrons of America—wives and mothers—to contemplate, and to realise, the picture of the fate of Scio [Chios], and to use their influence in exciting a general and powerful emotion, in behalf of the sufferers, in a war like this; and, while they draw round their firesides, and miss no member from his place in the happy circle there, to think of the mothers and the daughters, bred up like themselves in ease and competence, in the garden of the Levant—sold in the open market, driven with ropes about their necks into Turkish transports, and doomed to the indignities of a Syrian or an Algerine slavery. . . . We call upon the friends of freedom and humanity to take an interest in the struggles of five millions of Christians, rising, not in consequence of “revolutionary intrigues”, as has been falsely asserted by the crowned arbiters of Europe, but by the impulse of nature, and in vindication of rights long and intolerably trampled upon. We invoke the ministers of religion to take up a solemn testimony in the cause; to assert the rights of fellowmen and of fellow Christians; to plead for the victims whose great crime is Christianity. We call on the citizens of America to remember the time, and it is within the memory of thousands that now live, when our own beloved, prosperous country waited at the door of France and the State of Holland, pleading for a little money and few troops; and not to disregard the call of those who are struggling against a tyranny infinitely more galling than that, which our fathers thought it beyond the power of man to support.<sup>21</sup>

The Philhellenic theme of the Greek relief committees speedily was taken up by other organs of public opinion. The press was uniformly friendly to the Greek cause, if we except the fact that now and then was sounded a note of caution lest the government thereby become involved in the tangled politics of Europe. The state legislatures of Maryland, South Carolina, and Kentucky adopted resolutions, and the governors of New York and Massachusetts delivered messages, of warm sympathy for the Greeks.<sup>22</sup> During the single

<sup>21</sup> *Address of the Committee appointed at a Public Meeting held in Boston, December 19, 1823, for the Relief of the Greeks* (Boston, press of the *North American Review*, 1823). See also *Address of the Committee of the Greek Fund of the City of New York to their Fellow-citizens throughout the United States* (New York, 1823); “The Case of the Greeks”, in *Miscellaneous Essays*, by M. Carey (Philadelphia, 1830). For typical press accounts of Turkish atrocities see *Niles’ Register*, XXI. (1821) 62 *et seq.*, XXII. (1822) 389 *et seq.*

<sup>22</sup> *Messages from Governors* (ed. C. Z. Lincoln), III. (Albany, 1909); *Boston Daily Advertiser*, Jan. 8, 1824.

month of December, 1823, the House of Representatives received resolutions of the legislature of South Carolina stating that her citizens would "hail with pleasure the recognition by the American Government of the independence of Greece"; a memorial from the citizens of Boston reciting Turkish atrocities in the Peloponnesus and the Aegean islands; a petition from a distinguished committee in New York expressing the hope "either that the independence of the Greeks may be speedily and formally recognized, or such steps preparatory thereto taken as may, in the opinion of the Government, be consistent with its interests, its policy, and its honor"; a request from residents of the District of Columbia that the cause of the Greeks "may engage the early and favorable attention of Congress".<sup>23</sup> Pulpits throughout the country rang with sermons and orations in praise of the Greeks and in appeal for those supplies which would enable them to throw off a despotic and infidel rule.<sup>24</sup> In imitation of Byron, poets and literary men like William Cullen Bryant and Fitz-Greene Halleck wielded their pens in stout defense of the Greeks, in whom they saw heroic descendants of classic forefathers.<sup>25</sup> Everywhere public sentiment was aroused on behalf of freedom, culture, and Christianity.

### III.

In the spring of 1824 a group of young Americans left for Greece to offer their services to the Hellenic army. Foremost among these was Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, of Boston, then a young physician just out of Harvard, later a famous philanthropist and the husband of Julia Ward Howe. Deeply moved by the tragic death of Byron, Howe sailed for the Mediterranean in June, 1824, and arrived at Missolonghi the following January. He had a long and

<sup>23</sup> *Annals of Congress*, 18 Cong., 1 sess., I. 843, 847, 889, 931, 1083; *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, V. 251-252, 261-262.

<sup>24</sup> Typical sermons and orations are the following, selected at random: Ezekiel G. Gear, *Sermon delivered at the taking up of a Collection for the Benefit of the Greeks, in the Village of Ithaca*, Jan. 18, 1824 (Ithaca, 1824), upon the text "As we have opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of Faith"; Solomon Drowne, *Oration in Commemoration of the Birthday of Washington and in Aid of the Cause of the Greeks* (Providence, 1824), containing as appendixes odes specially written for the occasion; S. E. Dwight, *Address delivered in Park Street Church, Boston, April 1, 1824, and repeated at the Request of the Greek Committee, in the Old South Church, April 14, 1824* (second edition, Boston, 1824), published at the request of the Greek Committee.

<sup>25</sup> Poems of William Cullen Bryant dealing with the Greek revolution are: "The Massacre at Scio" (1824), "Song of the Greek Amazon" (1824), "To a Cloud" (1824), "The Greek Partisan" (1825), "The Conjunction of Jupiter and Venus" (1826), and "The Greek Boy" (1828). Fitz-Greene Halleck's "Marco Bozzaris" (1825) became almost immediately a great popular favorite.

distinguished career as a medical officer with the Greek army, later was named surgeon-general of the Greek navy, returned to America in 1828 to wage a crusade for additional funds for Greek relief, wrote a history of the Greek Revolution, and went back to Greece as one of the principal agents of the American committees in the distribution of supplies despatched to destitute Greek civilians. No other Philhellene, save perhaps Gabriel Eynard of Geneva, did so much for the insurgent Hellenic provinces and the cause of their independence.<sup>26</sup>

Departing shortly after Howe but reaching Greece somewhat earlier was Jonathan P. Miller, of Randolph, Vermont, a former non-commissioned officer in the United States army and a veteran of the War of 1812. Miller's expenses for equipment and transportation were paid by the Boston committee, which also sent him small remittances from time to time during the period of his service with the Greek forces. He was a courageous soldier, as well as an excellent instructor in military affairs; therefore he proved to be of great service in Greece. In addition, he wrote regular and long letters to the Boston committee and the Boston press, thus keeping alive a popular interest in Hellenic independence which otherwise might have died. After leaving the Greek army as a colonel, he was returned to Greece by the New York committee in 1827 as their principal agent in the distribution of relief supplies.<sup>27</sup>

Besides Jarvis,<sup>28</sup> Howe, and Miller, there were other Americans whose careers are not so well known. There was, for example, one George Wilson, of Providence, Rhode Island, a gunner in the Greek fleet. "Such was the gallantry which he displayed in the action with the Turkish fleet in the Gulf of Lepanto, that Lord Cochrane publicly drank his health at a dinner party given in commemoration of the event."<sup>29</sup> There was also James Williams, an heroic negro from Baltimore, who had served under Decatur off the coast of

<sup>26</sup> Constantin Rados, "Webster, Monroë et le Philhellénisme aux États Unis pendant la Guerre de l'Indépendance Grecque", in *L'Acropole*, I. (Paris, 1920) 39-48; F. B. Sanborn, *Dr. S. G. Howe* (New York, 1891), in the American Reformers Series; *Letters and Journals of Samuel Gridley Howe*, volume I., as previously cited, a valuable work; Julia Ward Howe, *Reminiscences, 1819-1899* (New York, 1899), pp. 85-86, 312-321; *id.*, *Memoir of Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe* (Boston, 1876); John Greenleaf Whittier's poem "The Hero", dealing with an incident of Howe's service in Greece; S. G. Howe, *An Historical Sketch of the Greek Revolution* (two editions, New York, 1828).

<sup>27</sup> Albany *Argus*, May 13, 1825; Boston *Daily Advertiser*, 1824-1827, *passim*; J. P. Miller, *The Condition of Greece in 1827 and 1828* (New York, 1828), an account of Miller's relief work; Howe, *Letters and Journals*, pp. 28-29, 119-120.

<sup>28</sup> *Supra*, pp. 46-47.

<sup>29</sup> Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

Algiers; he enlisted as a cook in the Greek fleet of Lord Cochrane but tired of the kitchen and "conducted himself with great coolness and intrepidity in several engagements, particularly at the battle in the Gulf of Lepanto, where he showed truly that he had been in the school of Decatur; for when no Greek could be found to take the helm [of the *Sauveur*], Williams volunteered his services, and was there struck down by a splinter, which broke his leg and arm".<sup>30</sup>

Less heroic than Williams or any of his fellow-Americans previously mentioned were two gentlemen of fortune who appear to have brought discredit upon the American name. The first of these was Lieutenant William T. Washington, of Washington, D. C., a former cadet at West Point, who falsely described himself as a nephew of the great general. According to Howe, he was "a mere carpet-knight, an unprincipled, dissipated fellow" who said he would not remain in Greece "unless with the character of a soldier he could combine that of a man of pleasure". He distinguished himself by becoming involved in questionable financial dealings at the expense of the Boston relief committee, became deeply enmeshed in the feuds of rival Greek chieftains, and finally met an inglorious death in a battle between Greek factions in 1827. The second adventurer of doubtful reputation was Lieutenant Allen, who had been dishonorably discharged from the navy of the United States. He appears to have served with distinction in the Greek army, but he never lived down his bad record and was a source of constant annoyance to the commander of the American naval squadron in the Mediterranean.<sup>31</sup>

American Philhellenism failed to make as successful a showing on the field of action as it made in the halls of Congress, in the pulpit, in the columns of the press, and in the raising of funds. Howe was astonished and chagrined that more "young men of fortune do not come to Greece; that they do not enlist heart and soul in this most sacred of all causes, and gain for themselves the gratitude of a nation and a place in history; more particularly, too, when they have such a scene before their eyes as is presented by the treatment of Lafayette in our happy and flourishing country".<sup>32</sup> But it was no mean task to find young Americans who were "ready and eager to give up ease, custom, money-getting, and go overseas to fight a savage foe among savage mountains, all for the love of freedom, and of that dear land which was next in affections to their own, the land of the

<sup>30</sup> Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

<sup>31</sup> Howe, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-29, 100-102, 231-232; C. O. Paullin, *Commodore John Rodgers*, pp. 357-358.

<sup>32</sup> Lafayette made his triumphal visit to the United States during 1824-1825, *i.e.*, at about the time Howe was writing.

imperishable Ideal". Those who did go frequently had motives other than, or in addition to, love of Greece. Howe, for example, who was the most intelligent and the most devoted of the Americans in Greece, admits to have been impelled by a disappointment in love; by a desire to escape the necessity "to sit down to drag out my days in the dull, monotonous round of a professional life"; by a conviction that "independent of the real service that I shall be to the cause of liberty, I shall improve myself more in one year [in Greece], than I could do in Boston in five"; by a desire to learn foreign languages.<sup>33</sup> These were all worthy motives but could not have been deemed equally impelling by all young Americans. Nevertheless, Jarvis, Miller, and Howe were Steubens and Kosciuskos and Kalbs of the Greek War of Independence; they were significant in influence if not powerful in numbers.

#### IV.

In the spring of 1826 there was aired a scandal which promised to undo in the minds of the Greeks and of Europe any good which may have been done in the varied activities of American Philhellenes up to this point. It appears that in November, 1824, the Greek deputies in London, but recently possessed of a loan from English bankers, approached Mr. Rush, the American minister, to ascertain what might be done in procuring ships of war from the United States. Mr. Rush—desirous "to see money expended in the United States by foreigners, whenever it may be done in the way of lawful traffick"—informed the Greek emissaries that although the government of the United States could not in any way provide naval materials to the Greek government, "it might perhaps be competent to individual citizens, or shipwrights of the United States to receive proposals, consistently with the duties of neutrality".<sup>34</sup> Inquiries were accordingly made in America concerning the cost of frigates of fifty guns, and an estimate of about \$250,000 each, submitted by LeRoy, Bayard, and Company, of New York, of which William Bayard, chairman of the New York Greek committee, was a member, was accepted by the Greeks.

For reasons which need not be gone into here the actual cost of constructing the two ships contracted for was more than \$750,000, a sum far in excess of the abilities of the Greeks to pay. In order for Greece to obtain one of the frigates, therefore, it was necessary to sell the other. The affair became so great a public scandal in Europe

<sup>33</sup> Howe, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-22, 29-30.

<sup>34</sup> Richard Rush to John Quincy Adams, Dec. 13, 1824. Department of State, Great Britain, volume 30, no. 410.

and America, that the government of the United States determined to take over the second of the two frigates, the *Liberator*. This was accordingly arranged in May, 1826, at an appraisal price of only \$230,000, considerably less than the ship cost the Hellenic government. This was, in the circumstances, the best of a bad bargain, and in October, after many discouraging wrangles between the Greeks and the contractors, the frigate *Hope* (subsequently renamed *Hellas*) passed Sandy Hook under full sail for the Aegean.

A prolonged controversy ensued in the American press concerning the degree of culpability, if any, of the American shipbuilding firms. Perhaps as satisfactory a summary as any is that of the *London Times*, which, after publishing a statement issued by the Americans involved, said editorially: "We have almost exhausted our fund of investigation and indignation on the English contractors for Greek loans and therefore have but little left to bestow on the conduct of the American contractors."<sup>35</sup>

Concerning the whole affair Madison wrote Lafayette in November, 1826:

Another mortifying topic is the Greek equipment at New York. It appears the ample fund for two frigates at an early day has procured but one which has but recently sailed. The indignation of the public is highly excited; and a regular investigation of the lamentable abuse is going on. In the meantime Greece is bleeding in consequence of it, as is every heart that sympathizes with her noble cause.<sup>36</sup>

## V.

There was a falling off in the activities of Philhellenic committees during the latter half of 1825, and during most of 1826 nothing at all was done in the way of raising money and forwarding supplies to Greece. The scandal of the frigates, however, served the purpose of arousing the American public conscience from a state of apathy and self-satisfaction; it now appeared that much more would have to be done, lest the name American be a stench in Greek nostrils. In addition, a series of tragedies which overcame Greek arms during 1826 and 1827 made the appeal to American generosity more impelling than at any previous time during the revolt. In April, 1826, after an heroic resistance to siege extending over a year, the Greek garrison of Missolonghi was overcome by Turco-Egyptian forces, and the town and its inhabitants fell victim to a brutal sack and massacre. The American press had been watching the siege of

<sup>35</sup> Quoted by *Niles' Register*, XXXI. (1826) 259. The best account of the frigate scandal is in the *American Quarterly Review*, edited by William Cullen Bryant, I. (1827) 254-285.

<sup>36</sup> *Writings of James Madison*, IX. 264.



Missolonghi—the scene of Byron's romantic activities—with keen interest, but with a false sense of security concerning the impregnability of the town. Therefore the news of the Ottoman victory, which reached America in the middle of May, was received with genuine horror. Later, as details of the destruction of Missolonghi found their way into the newspapers of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, heartfelt sympathy for war-ridden Greece was once more aroused. This the Americans in Greece, particularly Howe and Miller, did their best to stimulate by letters to the press and subsequently by their return home actively to engage in the raising of funds.<sup>37</sup> The winter of 1826-1827 saw the civilian population of Greece alternately victimized by Ottoman troops and by Greek bandits. Then, in June, 1827, came the recapture by the Turks of Athens and the Acropolis, and the initiation of a campaign of ruthless destruction by Ibrahim Pasha. It was long since apparent to all friends of Greece, therefore, that whatever the outcome of the war of independence only heroic measures would save Greek women and children from starvation.

Hence, in December, 1826, Edward Everett in Washington and Mathew Carey in Philadelphia initiated a new campaign for the raising of funds for Greece.<sup>38</sup> In January, 1827, a distinguished committee began work in New York and engaged Colonel Jonathan P. Miller to supervise the distribution of supplies overseas. The response everywhere was gratifying. In New York City alone almost six thousand dollars were raised during the month of January. By March, the first of several relief ships, containing money, clothing, and provisions, had sailed for the Aegean. In May, another ship left New York, with John R. Stuyvesant, a descendant of Peter Stuyvesant, as supercargo. Dr. John D. Russ, of Massachusetts, was sent to join Howe in the administration of medical relief to a stricken Greek population. An attempt was made to have Congress appropriate fifty thousand dollars, and the legislature of the state of New York donate a thousand barrels of flour, to the cause of Greek relief, but in each case the measure was defeated.<sup>39</sup> All told, from

<sup>37</sup> See a long letter from Howe in the *New York Evening Post*, Aug. 25, 1826, discussing the fall of Missolonghi. Howe also was in active correspondence with Edward Everett, who, he hoped, would once more head Philhellenic activity in America.

<sup>38</sup> See Carey's appeal to the people of Pennsylvania in his *Miscellaneous Essays*, previously cited, pp. 297-300.

<sup>39</sup> *Annals of Congress*, 19 Cong., 2 sess., III. 578-580, 654; *New York Senate Journal*, fiftieth session, p. 274; *New York Assembly Journal*, fiftieth session, part II., pp. 784, 865; see also *Report of the Joint Committee of the Senate and Assembly on the Appropriation for the Relief of the Greeks*, printed separately as a pamphlet (Albany, 1827).



January, 1827, to March, 1828, the New York committee raised almost forty thousand dollars, the Philadelphia committee more than twenty-five thousand, and the Boston and other committees proportionate amounts. The actual value of the first six cargoes shipped to Greece during 1827 was in excess of seventy-five thousand dollars. In June, 1827, Howe described the arrival of the ships *Chancellor* and *Six Brothers* from New York in the following terms:

About them all I can say is, that a universal and deep feeling of gratitude is expressed by the thousands of poor, half-starved beings who have been fed and clad, and they pray God to crown with his blessing the generous freemen of America. The vessels came most opportunely, and not only the poor about here, but the half-starved wretches who came out of Athens, partook of them.<sup>40</sup>

In addition to distributing relief in Greece, the committees brought a number of Greek orphans to America for adoption by American families. Lieutenant-Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts set the example to the people of his state by taking one of these parentless refugees into his own home.<sup>41</sup>

It will be recalled that the funds raised in the United States for the Greeks in the earlier days of the revolt had been intended for the purchase of military supplies and that they had been turned over to the Greek government without reservation as to their use. In this latter period of American relief activities, however, the practice was fundamentally changed. The various committees adopted the procedure of the New York committee in instructing its agents to permit none of their supplies to be diverted to military purposes: "As it is not the object of the Executive Committee [ran the instructions] to take any part in the controversy between the Greeks and Turks, these provisions and clothing are not designed to supply the garrisons of the former, but are intended for the relief of the women, children, and old men, non-combatants of Greece."<sup>42</sup> This policy met with sharp opposition on the part of the Greek government, and it was only with the greatest difficulty that Miller and his associates prevented the seizure of their supplies by the Hellenic military authorities.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Howe, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

<sup>41</sup> A fairly complete account of the relief activities of 1827-1828 may be gathered from three sources, in addition to the press: Howe, *op. cit.*, p. 197 to end of the volume; Carey, *op. cit.*, pp. 300-309; J. P. Miller, *The Condition of Greece in 1827 and 1828* (New York, 1828), published under the direction of the Executive Greek Committee of the City of New York. See also a book full of inherent interest, by H. A. V. Post, one of the agents of the New York committee, *A Visit to Greece and Constantinople* (New York, 1830).

<sup>42</sup> Miller, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12.

<sup>43</sup> See a protest of Sir Richard Church, a British general commanding Greek troops, in the *New York Evening Post*, Oct. 10, 1827, and a protest of the Hellenic government itself, *ibid.*, Nov. 8, 1827.

Furthermore, the American Philhellenic committees, instead of delivering their funds or provisions to Greek officials, insisted that they be distributed in Greece by Americans sent abroad for that purpose. This practice was due to at least two reasons: first, it would have been difficult for any government as hard pressed as that of Greece to abide loyally by the terms of gift and to avoid the use of American contributions for military purposes; second, there had been charges in Europe, well or ill founded, that some of the Greek revolutionaries had not been altogether scrupulous in their expenditure of earlier donations and of the funds borrowed from English bankers.<sup>44</sup> In any case the precedents established by Greek relief committees in 1827 have been uniformly adhered to in all subsequent American philanthropic activities in the Near East—funds have been devoted exclusively to relief of civilians, and the distribution of supplies has been under American, not native, supervision.

By the end of the year 1827 there was every indication that Greek independence was not far distant. There then remained for the Greek committees in America only the task of carrying the Greek population through the hard winter that followed. When the Russians crossed the Pruth in May, 1828, assuring the freedom of the Greeks, the first chapter in American relief work in the Near East had been brought to a close.

## VI.

Philhellenism was an emotion rather than a reasoned conviction. In physical heritage the modern Greeks have little Hellenic blood in their veins; their cultural heritage is Christian and Byzantine rather than pagan and Hellenistic; in actual fact they have played a comparatively small part in the preservation, reconstruction, and reinterpretation of the classics; they were largely unconscious of their classical heritage until educated to it by Westerners and by Greeks, like Koraës, who had been educated in the West. The illusions of American Philhellenes were the illusions of European friends of Greece. They exaggerated the virtues of the Greeks and ignored their vices. The few Americans who ventured to point out that the Greeks had the ordinary human faults and shortcomings, plus those of a people long held in subjection, were accused of being uncharitable. And for those who had the temerity to suggest that something might be said in defense of the Turks there was reserved supreme contempt.

<sup>44</sup> See, e.g., S. G. Howe, *Historical Sketch of the Greek Revolution*, pp. 371-379.

It is significant that the press and other organs of American public opinion during the Greek War of Independence, although eloquent and verbose on the subject of Turkish atrocities, were silent concerning the brutalities of Greek armed forces. The massacres of defenseless Moslems at Galatz, at Jassy, at Monemvasia, at Navarino, at Tripolitza, and elsewhere went unreported, with the exception that occasionally a journal justified the slaughter of Turks (men, women, and children) on the ground that "if they had not been killed, they would most certainly have massacred the Greeks".<sup>45</sup> That a Turkish population of twenty-five thousand in the Morea had been practically exterminated—while Greeks sang "In the Morea shall no Turk be left, nor in the whole wide world"—was a matter of small concern to generous-hearted Americans. Although American Christians were rightly horrified and outraged at the hanging of the Patriarch of Constantinople, there was no protest in the United States against the execution by Greek officers of a former Sheikh-ul-Islam, who had been deposed and exiled from Turkey for having used the high influence of his position in behalf of a policy of moderation on the part of the Sultan toward the latter's Greek subjects. Mistreatment and death were the invariable fate of Turkish military prisoners; degradation and slavery were the lot of captive Moslem women and children.<sup>46</sup> The truth is that by both Greeks and Turks the war was waged as a war of extermination, accompanied by the most obscene and barbarous cruelty. But American public opinion had neither eyes nor ears for the atrocities committed by Christian Greeks, while it indulged its justifiable indignation concerning the savagery of the heathen Turks. In this respect a precedent was set which has not been departed from to this day.

There were Philhellenes, to be sure, who believed that no useful purpose would be served by exaggerating the crimes of the Turks and the virtues of the Greeks. Byron himself had warned against blackening the Ottomans and whitewashing the Hellenes.<sup>47</sup> Dr. Howe, the American above all others who deserves the title Philhellene, was distressed at the tendency in the United States to canonize the insurrectionaries of the Peloponnesus. In the preface to his history of the Greek revolution he wrote:

The author has never, for an instant, let his enthusiasm blind him to the faults of the Greeks, or influence him in recording them; nor has he ever ranked himself among those Philhellenes, who have imagined that the cause of Greece was to be advanced, by holding up to the world a

<sup>45</sup> *Niles' Register*, XXIII. (1822) 81.

<sup>46</sup> W. Alison Phillips, *The Greek War of Independence, 1821-1833* (New York, 1897), pp. 32-34, 48-67, 76-77, 99-100, etc., *passim*.

<sup>47</sup> See *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, canto II., Additional Note, on the Turks.

false picture of the disinterested patriotism, or heroic courage of the modern Greeks.<sup>48</sup>

This was a standard to which, indeed, Dr. Howe had been true from the outset. He had willingly paid tribute to the fine discipline and courage of the Turkish soldier and to the chivalrous conduct of some of the most distinguished Ottoman commanders. He had frankly condemned Greek brigandage by land and piracy by sea, mistreatment by Greek troops of a helpless Greek peasantry, jealousy and intrigue among Greek leaders, and Greek brutality in the conduct of the war. He also attempted to impress upon his countrymen that the Christianity of the Greek Orthodox Church was a far cry from the Calvinism of Massachusetts.<sup>49</sup> But all of this appears to have been submerged in a wave of bitter anti-Turkish feeling which would permit no contradiction. When Messrs. Randolph and Smyth of Virginia protested in the House of Representatives in January, 1824, that the Turks had been unnecessarily vilified, they were looked upon with disfavor.<sup>50</sup> When the New York *Evening Post* urged caution in the adoption of a governmental policy toward the Greek revolt, it was held up to popular condemnation "as enlisted in the cause of the Turks—if the Turks wanted a paper in New York, the *Evening Post* was already fitted to their service".<sup>51</sup> An editorial in the *National Advocate* in January, 1827, headed "Hear Both Sides", was by other newspapers labelled "unfeeling", "heartless ridicule", "wanton buffoonery". In short, American public opinion of a century ago concerning Near Eastern affairs bore a striking resemblance to a corresponding American public opinion of to-day.

EDWARD MEAD EARLE.

<sup>48</sup> *An Historical Sketch of the Greek Revolution*, p. vi.

<sup>49</sup> *Letters and Journals*, pp. 56-58, 89-92, 121-122, 235-236, 247, 259-260. See also Howe's letter in the *Commercial Advertiser*, Oct. 1, 1827.

<sup>50</sup> *Abridgment of the Debates of Congress*, VII. 657, 661. Randolph said that while we held negroes in bondage in America we had best be more restrained in our criticisms concerning the "slavery" in which Turks held the Greeks. He ventured the judgment that Ottoman foreign policy was less perfidious than that of the "Most Christian", "Most Catholic", and "Most Faithful" Majesties of Europe; at least Turkey was not a member of the Holy Alliance and did not interfere in the internal affairs of other nations. Smyth said that the Turks were more tolerant of Christians than their Christian neighbors were of dissenters and heretics. It had been pointed out that there were seven million Greek Christians in the Ottoman dominions. "This proves that the Mahometan is more tolerant than the Holy Catholic Church. Where will you find seven millions of dissenters in a Catholic country?"

<sup>51</sup> New York *Evening Post*, Jan. 29, 1824.

## ANDREW JACKSON AND THE RISE OF SOUTH- WESTERN DEMOCRACY

THE name of Andrew Jackson is inseparably linked with the rise of Western democracy, but the biographers of the general have confined their attention largely to his military exploits and to his contest for and occupancy of the presidency. It is not these phases of his life, however, which connect him most intimately with the struggle of the pioneer and early Western farmer for political power. Before he was a general or a presidential possibility, he was a Tennessee politician. In this capacity he was closely associated with those events which constituted an integral part of the democratic movement of the West. A study of this phase of his career, and of the setting in which he worked, should give a better idea of the man and of the cause for which his name has come to stand.

In 1796 Tennessee adopted her first constitution. Jackson was a member of the committee which drafted it. For its day it was a liberal document, but among its provisions were two which later attracted much unfavorable attention. One provided that the justices of the peace should be chosen by the general assembly for life terms, and that the justices should choose, with a few exceptions, the other county officials;<sup>1</sup> the second stipulated that all acreage should be taxed at the same rate, regardless of value.<sup>2</sup>

These provisions make it clear that the democracy of the West had not grown to full stature by 1796. The peculiarities of the early frontier go far toward explaining this fact. The familiar portraits of John Sevier show him in military costume of the Continental type, such as officers of the line wore during the Revolutionary War, but in his fighting days he wore a hunting shirt as did the men who followed him as he tracked the elusive Indian through the forest.<sup>3</sup> Distinctions existed on the border, but they were not patent to the eye and the simple backwoodsman was not alive to them. The voters who elected delegates to the constitutional convention of 1796 did not realize to what extent they were smoothing the way for the self-aggrandizement of their leaders, the colonels, the legislators, and the land-grabbers—classifications which greatly overlapped.

<sup>1</sup> Art. V., sec. 12; art. VI., sec. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Art. I., sec. 26.

<sup>3</sup> J. G. M. Ramsey, *Annals of Tennessee* (Kingsport, Tenn., 1926), p. 711.

The years which elapsed between 1796 and 1812 were years of relative peace and considerable growth for the Southwest, but frontier conditions persisted throughout the period. The settlers, whether in town or country, continued, in the main, to live in log cabins and wear homespun. The acquisition of Louisiana and the final opening of the Mississippi River to the trade of the West was a boon to the country. Such towns as Nashville began to emerge from the primitive and to take on the appearance of civilization. Yet it was only with great difficulty that the rivers could be ascended by keel boats, and the majority of the roads were mere trails through the woods. Money was scarce, and the interchange of goods was difficult and hazardous. Barter was still commonly employed in conducting commercial transactions.<sup>4</sup>

The War of 1812 ushered in a change. Tennessee troops saw considerable service in the campaigns against the Indians and the British, and the supplies necessary for their maintenance were secured largely in the West. This brought ready money into regions which had previously known little of its use,<sup>5</sup> and money meant purchasing power, and luxuries, and trade. Moccasins gave place to shoes, and log cabins to brick and frame houses. The Indians caused less trouble after Jackson's conquest of the Creeks in 1813, and large tracts of land were wrested from the natives. The depression suffered by our infant industries as a result of the dumping of British goods on the American market at the end of the long European wars, and the depleted condition of the soils of the South Atlantic states were conditions tending to force population westward.<sup>6</sup> The Cotton Kingdom of the Gulf region was planted in these years.<sup>7</sup> The high price of the staple, which reached thirty-four cents a pound in 1817,<sup>8</sup> hastened this movement, and the steamboat came just in time to facilitate the commercial side of the development.<sup>9</sup>

Specie payments had been suspended by the banks south of New England in 1814, and cheap paper money had been one of the ele-

<sup>4</sup> Account book of H. Tatum, merchant, Nashville, 1793-1798, Tennessee Historical Society MSS., Box T-1, no. 5; *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, ed. J. S. Bassett (Washington, 1926), I. 89-90, 99-101.

<sup>5</sup> *Nashville Gazette*, Oct. 29, 1820.

<sup>6</sup> A. O. Craven, *Soil Exhaustion as a Factor in the Agricultural History of Virginia and Maryland* (Urbana, Ill., 1926), pp. 118-121.

<sup>7</sup> T. P. Abernethy, *Formative Period in Alabama* (Montgomery, Ala., 1922), pp. 50-56.

<sup>8</sup> U. S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Farm Management, *Atlas of American Agriculture* (Washington, 1918), pt. V., sec. A, 20.

<sup>9</sup> Moore and Foster, *Tennessee, the Volunteer State* (Chicago, 1923), II. 85-86; *Nashville Banner*, Apr. 14, 1827.

ments conducive to the rapid exploitation of the West which followed the war.<sup>10</sup> In 1817 the Second Bank of the United States went into operation, and it was hoped that it would, by bringing pressure to bear upon doubtful state banks, be able to restore the currency of the country to a sound basis.<sup>11</sup> This meant the retirement of much worthless paper money issued by the state banks, and a consequent restraint on speculative operations.

In order to offset this curtailment of currency and credit, Tennessee chartered a "litter" of state banks in 1817.<sup>12</sup> Kentucky did likewise during the next year.<sup>13</sup> At the same time, the legislature of Tennessee prevented the establishment of a branch of the Bank of the United States within her borders by levying a tax of \$50,000 a year upon any such institution.<sup>14</sup> This prohibitive measure was sponsored by Hugh Lawson White,<sup>15</sup> while the opposition was led by Felix Grundy<sup>16</sup> and supported by William Carroll and Andrew Jackson.<sup>17</sup> Its passage seems to indicate the jealousy felt by local financial interests rather than the influence of constitutional scruples on the subject.

The period of speculation was followed by the panic of 1819. East Tennessee had largely escaped the financial excesses of the post-war boom,<sup>18</sup> for her valleys were not suited to the culture of cotton, and transportation was so difficult as to make commercial expansion almost impossible. In Middle Tennessee, however, the growing of cotton was far more widespread during these years than it is at the present time. It was, for instance, Jackson's principal crop at the Hermitage, whereas one now has to travel many miles south of Nashville before reaching cotton country. The very high price which the staple commanded from 1815 to 1819 was the primary cause of this

<sup>10</sup> D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States* (New York, 1920), pp. 144-145.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 145-151.

<sup>12</sup> Tennessee, *Public Acts*, 1817, pp. 163-180.

<sup>13</sup> McMaster, *History of the People of the United States* (New York, 1895), IV. 508.

<sup>14</sup> Tennessee, *Public Acts*, 1817, pp. 138-139.

<sup>15</sup> John Catron to Polk, June 17, 1837. Papers of James K. Polk in Library of Congress; *A Memoir of Hugh Lawson White*, ed. Nancy N. Scott (Philadelphia, 1856), pp. 19-23.

<sup>16</sup> St. George L. Sioussat, "Some Phases of Tennessee Politics in the Jackson Period", in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XIV. 60; *Nashville Whig*, Feb. 7, 1818.

<sup>17</sup> James Phelan, *History of Tennessee* (Boston, 1888), pp. 394-395; R. C. H. Catterall, *Second Bank of the United States*, p. 183.

<sup>18</sup> Thos. Emmerson to John Overton, Oct. 24, 1820, John Overton Papers in Tennessee Historical Society library; P. M. Miller to Jackson, Aug. 9, 1820, Jackson Papers in Library of Congress; *Nashville Gazette*, June 20, 1820; *Knoxville Register*, June 20, 1820.



expansion, and the result was that thousands of farmers in this section were ruined when the price fell and the panic came on in 1819. Between five and six hundred suits for debt were entered at one term of the court of Davidson County<sup>19</sup>—the county of which Nashville is the seat of justice.

The indications are that the panic of 1819 hit the small farmers of the Southwest harder than has any succeeding financial disaster. After settled conditions are established and farms are paid for, economic crises do their worst only among the trading and speculating classes, but in new country the farmers are the speculators. The result in this case was that the democracy, for the first time, rose up to demand legislative relief.

In Tennessee the agitation was led by Felix Grundy, who piloted through the assembly a bill providing for the establishment of a loan office.<sup>20</sup> The state was to furnish the capital, the legislature was to elect the directors, and the loans were to be apportioned among the counties according to the taxes paid in each. A "stay" law was also enacted which provided that any creditor who refused to receive the notes issued by the loan office, or state bank, as it was called, would be required to wait two years before he could enforce collection of his debt.<sup>21</sup> These measures were passed by the votes of Middle Tennessee, East Tennessee being opposed.<sup>22</sup> For the first and last time, the debtors of the state were clearly in the saddle.

Within a few months Kentucky established a loan office similar to that of Tennessee,<sup>23</sup> and in 1823 Alabama launched a state-owned bank.<sup>24</sup> Relief legislation was quite general throughout the states south of New England.<sup>25</sup>

The only prominent men in Middle Tennessee who were conspicuous for their opposition to these measures were Edward Ward and Andrew Jackson. They addressed a memorial of protest to the assembly which that body refused to accept on the ground that its language was disrespectful to the law-makers. The memorial did, in fact, charge the members who voted for the loan office act with perjury since they had taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and now assented to a law which made something beside gold and silver a tender in payment of debts.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Jackson to Capt. James Gadsden, Aug. 1, 1819, *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, ed. J. S. Bassett, II. 421; *Nashville Clarion*, July 13, 1819.

<sup>20</sup> *Knoxville Register*, July 18, 1820.

<sup>21</sup> Tennessee, *Public Acts*, 1820, p. 13.

<sup>22</sup> Tennessee Assembly, *Journal of the House*, 1820, p. 129.

<sup>23</sup> *Nashville Gazette*, Dec. 9, 1820.

<sup>24</sup> T. P. Abernethy, *Formative Period in Alabama*, p. 99.

<sup>25</sup> Thos. H. Benton, *Thirty Years' View* (New York, 1854), I. 5.

<sup>26</sup> *Nashville Clarion*, July 25, 1820; *Knoxville Register*, Aug. 15, 1820.

In 1821 Tennessee experienced one of her most exciting gubernatorial elections. The candidates were Edward Ward and William Carroll. The former was he who had, together with Jackson, protested against the loan office; he was a native of Virginia, a man of education and wealth, and a neighbor to General Jackson.<sup>27</sup> The latter was a merchant from Pennsylvania who had opened the first nail store in Nashville. He was a young man of energy and address, and Jackson had befriended him in his early days. As major-general of Tennessee militia he had served with signal distinction at the battle of New Orleans, but a break, the causes of which are obscure, developed between him and Jackson in 1816.<sup>28</sup>

In the contest of 1821 Jackson used his influence in support of Ward, and looked upon Carroll and his friends as a group of demagogues.<sup>29</sup> The press of the state entered heartily into the campaign and Carroll was touted as a man of the people—an unpretentious merchant, without wealth and without social prestige—whereas Ward's wealth, his slaves, and his education were held against him. He was pictured in the press as a snobbish representative of the aristocracy of the planters.<sup>30</sup>

Both candidates were opposed to the loan office of 1820. Ward advocated a centralized state-banking system in place of it,<sup>31</sup> whereas Carroll simply stressed a policy of retrenchment.<sup>32</sup> The people appear to have discovered that the legislative relief was no panacea for their financial ills, and they were ready to accept Carroll's harsher doctrine of economy. They were beginning to understand that farmers, whose profits did not often run above five per cent., could not afford to borrow from banks at six per cent. Carroll carried every county in the state except two,<sup>33</sup> and the mere magnitude of the victory indicates that his success was due to his reputation for democracy rather than to his merchant-class economic ideas.

With the exception of a one-term intermission made necessary by the state constitution, William Carroll presided over the government of Tennessee continuously until 1835. He was the most constructive governor who ever held office in the state, for, curiously enough, it

<sup>27</sup> Hale and Merritt, *A History of Tennessee and Tennesseans* (Chicago, 1913), II. 267.

<sup>28</sup> Jackson to Coffee, Feb. 2, 1816, Papers of John Coffee in Tenn. Hist. Soc. library.

<sup>29</sup> Jackson to Coffee, July 26, 1821, *ibid.*; Jackson to Capt. John Donelson, Sept. 2, 1821, Jackson Papers.

<sup>30</sup> Knoxville *Register*, July 17, 1821; Nashville *Clarion*, July 18, 1821.

<sup>31</sup> Nashville *Gazette*, June 2, 1821; Nashville *Clarion*, June 13, 1821; Knoxville *Register*, June 16, 1821.

<sup>32</sup> Nashville *Clarion*, June 27, 1821.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, Aug. 15, 1821.

was he who, staunchly opposed by Jackson, established "Jacksonian democracy" within her borders. He believed in government of, for, and by the people, but he also believed in a financial policy of specie payments and legislative non-interference between debtor and creditor. Under his leadership, Tennessee disavowed the kind of democracy which had mounted into the saddle on the heels of the panic of 1819, and of which Felix Grundy had been the protagonist.

In his first message to the general assembly, the new chief magistrate outlined his policy. He stuck tenaciously to his programme throughout his twelve years in office, and, though it was slow work, nearly every item of his platform was finally carried into effect. In 1821 he advocated the erection of a penitentiary and the abolition of the use of the whipping post, the pillory, and the branding iron. These changes were finally brought about in 1831.<sup>34</sup> Imprisonment for debt was abolished at the same time.<sup>35</sup> In 1821 the "stay" law of 1820 was held unconstitutional by the supreme court of the state.<sup>36</sup> In 1826 the law of 1817 which prevented the establishment of a branch of the Bank of the United States in Tennessee was repealed with few dissenting votes in the lower house of the legislature,<sup>37</sup> and accordingly that institution established an office in Nashville during the following year. In 1831 the loan office of 1820 was abolished upon Carroll's recommendation,<sup>38</sup> and in 1832 and 1833 several important privately owned banks of the usual commercial type were established.<sup>39</sup> The sales of the public lands belonging to the state, which had been put upon a credit basis in 1819, were put upon a cash basis in 1823,<sup>40</sup> and the prices were graduated according to the principle later advocated in Congress by Thomas H. Benton.<sup>41</sup> Finally, after several unsuccessful attempts had been made in the legislature to bring the question before the people, a referendum was held and a constitutional convention assembled in 1834.<sup>42</sup> The new instrument

<sup>34</sup> See messages of 1821 and 1823, Tennessee Assembly, *Journal of the Senate*, 1821, pp. 86-99, and *Journal of the House*, 1823, pp. 9-15.

<sup>35</sup> Tennessee, *Public Acts*, 1831, p. 56.

<sup>36</sup> *Townsend v. Townsend et al.*, *Tennessee Reports* (Peck), pp. 1-21.

<sup>37</sup> Tennessee, *Public Acts*, 1826, p. 18; Tennessee Assembly, *Journal of the House*, 1826, pp. 173-174.

<sup>38</sup> Tennessee Assembly, *Journal of the Senate*, 1831, pp. 6-9, *Journal of the House*, 1831, pp. 41 *et seq.*

<sup>39</sup> Tennessee, *Public Acts*, 1832, pp. 2-13, and 1833, pp. 30-42; Phelan, *History of Tennessee*, pp. 267-268.

<sup>40</sup> Whitney, *Land Laws of Tennessee* (Chattanooga, 1891), pp. 387-394.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 398-400; see also Sioussat, "Tennessee Politics in the Jackson Period", *loc. cit.*, pp. 54-58.

<sup>42</sup> The question of calling a convention was voted on by the assembly and defeated in 1821, 1823, and 1826. It was finally carried by the assembly and ratified by popular vote in 1833.

of government which was now drawn up and adopted provided for a revision of the judicial system which would facilitate the collection of debts, for popular election of county officials, and for the taxation of real estate according to its value. Thus democracy won its victory in Tennessee, and the guiding spirit was that of William Carroll.

Up to this time, the state had gone through three distinct political phases. The first, extending from 1796 until the panic of 1819, was a period during which the people gratefully and implicitly accepted the leadership of a group of outstanding citizens. The frontiersman was busy with his clearings and he gladly accepted the services of such energetic men as would organize governments and fight the Indians. The fact that these same men were usually land speculators did not disturb him even if he knew it. Land was cheap.

The second period was that of the panic of 1819 during which economic ills aroused the people to a consciousness of their political power. Felix Grundy was the first to see the possibilities of the situation and to organize the movement for his own advancement. He was the first, but by no means the last, demagogue of Tennessee. Carroll won the people away from him and inaugurated the third period, which was one of constructive social and conservative economic legislation. It is noteworthy that until 1829 both Carroll and the legislature favored federal as well as state banks, nor does anything in the history of the state indicate that there was any general feeling against such institutions before Jackson became President.

It was well for Tennessee that Carroll remained so long in office, for the demagogue was not dead. The people had been aroused and Grundy had taught a lesson to the politicians. Public office was eagerly sought by the young lawyers and others, and electioneering, unknown in the earlier days, grew rapidly in vogue during the period following 1819. Stump speaking came to be an art and cajolery a profession, while whiskey flowed freely at the hustings. The politicians could most easily attain their object by appealing to the prejudices of the masses. Colleges were said to exist for the rich, and the ignorant were asked to elect the ignorant because enlightenment and intelligence were not democratic.<sup>43</sup> America, to say nothing of Tennessee, has not out-lived this brand of democracy.

It was during the years of Carroll's supremacy that the Jackson presidential boom took shape and ran its course. The relation between this movement and the rise of Western democracy is of con-

<sup>43</sup> For suggestions on this topic, see J. W. M. Breazeale, "Satirical Burlesque upon the Practice of Electioneering", in *Life as It Is* (Knoxville, 1842), pp. 158-226; and "An Address to Farmers and Mechanics", in *Works of Philip Lindsay* (Philadelphia, 1866), III. 265-316.

siderable interest for the reason that the two have ordinarily been considered as amounting to practically the same thing. The truth of the matter is that Jackson had little to do with the development of the democracy of the West. The movement made him President, but he contributed to it not one idea previously to his election in 1828. He rode into office upon a military reputation and the appeal which a self-made man can make so effectively to self-made men.

It did not take as astute a politician as Aaron Burr to see the possibility of making the Hero of New Orleans President of the United States. Not only Burr, but Edward Livingston and others saw it shortly after January 8, 1815.<sup>44</sup> In fact, the general himself probably saw it, but did not admit it. He at least began taking a keen interest in national politics and set himself the agreeable task of helping Monroe keep Crawford out of the chief magistracy,<sup>45</sup> for the enmity between the general and the secretary dates from 1816. It arose as a result of an agreement which Crawford negotiated with the Cherokees during that year, according to the terms of which the Indians were allowed to retain three million acres of land which the Creeks had claimed and which had been ceded to the government by Jackson's treaty of 1813. The Cherokees were also allowed damages for depredations alleged to have been committed by Jackson's troops during the course of the Creek campaign.<sup>46</sup> The general considered this a slur on his military reputation, and the author of it was duly condemned. It was also good political material, for Crawford was made to appear an enemy of the Western heroes and an opponent of westward expansion. It was only after the election of 1820, however, that the friends of Jackson could tactfully avow their intention to make him President, and the movement did not actually take shape until after his retirement from the governorship of Florida in 1821.

At the time when Jackson resigned this commission and returned to the Hermitage to spend his declining years "surrounded by the pleasures of domestic felicity", a little group of friends in Nashville was forming to make plans of campaign for their distinguished fel-

<sup>44</sup> J. S. Bassett, *Life of Andrew Jackson* (New York, 1925), p. 279; William Carroll to Jackson, Oct. 4, 1815, *id.*, *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, II. 217-218; James Parton, *Life of Andrew Jackson* (Boston, 1887), II. 350.

<sup>45</sup> A. P. Hayne to Jackson, Jan. 21, 1819, Jackson Papers; *id.* to *id.*, Mar. 6, 1819, Jackson to Governor Clark of Georgia, Apr. 20, 1819, *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, ed. J. S. Bassett, II. 412, 416; Address of Enoch Parsons, Mar. 25, 1819, Jackson Papers; Jackson to Coffee, Apr. 3, 1819, Coffee Papers.

<sup>46</sup> Parton, *Jackson*, II. 355-356; Bassett, *Jackson*, p. 281; Nashville *Whig*, July 31, 1819; Jackson to Monroe, Oct. 10, 1823, Jackson Papers; Jackson to Crawford, June 10, 13 ?, and 16, 1816, *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, ed. J. S. Bassett, II. 243-250.

low-townsmen. The leaders of this group were William B. Lewis, John Overton, and John H. Eaton.

The first-named was a planter and Jackson's neighbor. He was a close personal friend and adviser of long standing, but he was not a man of large affairs. Parton has overestimated his importance because he obtained much of his information on the campaign from Lewis himself.<sup>47</sup> John Overton was a former member of the supreme court of Tennessee and one of the richest men in the state. At that time he and Jackson were partners in a large land deal: namely, the establishment of a trading-town on the Mississippi by the name of Memphis.<sup>48</sup> They were closely associated in Jackson's political venture, too, and Overton later burned the papers relating thereto so that the curious might not pry into its details.<sup>49</sup> In 1816 John H. Eaton, then comparatively unknown in Tennessee, undertook to complete a biography of Jackson.<sup>50</sup> In 1818 he was appointed to the United States Senate,<sup>51</sup> and in 1819 he defended the general when the Seminole campaign was before that body for investigation.<sup>52</sup> From his vantage-point in Washington he served as field agent for the little group of Nashville managers.

Both Overton and Eaton were accused of having entertained Federalist opinions in their early days.<sup>53</sup> There was certainly nothing in the background or the connections of the group to tie it up with the democratic movement which was in full tide about them. In 1823 a former judge who had sat with Overton in the supreme court of the state wrote to him: "True republicanism must supersede the Democracy of the present day before public employment will be suited to my taste. . . . There are too many who would prefer a directly contrary state of things."<sup>54</sup> At about this time Jackson himself was keenly interested in a legal scheme to throw open to question the titles to about half the occupied lands in Tennessee. This, of course, was in the interest of speculators like him-

<sup>47</sup> Parton, *Jackson*, III. 17.

<sup>48</sup> Phelan, *History of Tennessee*, p. 317.

<sup>49</sup> W. W. Clayton, *History of Davidson County, Tennessee* (Philadelphia, 1880), p. 99.

<sup>50</sup> *Nashville Whig*, June 4, 1816.

<sup>51</sup> C. A. Miller, *Official and Political Manual of the State of Tennessee* (Nashville, 1890), p. 173.

<sup>52</sup> Jackson to William Williams, Sept. 25, 1819, Bassett, *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, II. 430.

<sup>53</sup> *Nashville Clarion*, Jan. 5, 1819; Phelan, *History of Tennessee*, p. 241.

<sup>54</sup> Thos. Emmerson to John Overton, May 25, 1823; see also *id.* to *id.*, Dec. 26, 1823, and June 3, 1824, Overton Papers.

self. The legislature however set itself against the plan and it failed miserably.<sup>55</sup>

The general had no personal dealings with either Grundy or Carroll during the early years of his candidacy, and though Grundy, with an eye to personal advancement, refused to break with him politically, and Carroll was later reconciled, it is significant that the latter is the only outstanding Tennessee Democrat who did not, sooner or later, receive federal recognition at the hands of Jackson's party.

Yet Jackson's political views were little known outside Tennessee at the time when he began to be looked upon as presidential timber. His strength lay in his military reputation, in his connection with the expansion of the West at the expense of the Spanish and Indians, and in the fact that he was not closely connected with the intrigue of Washington politics. A movement to turn out the "Virginia dynasty" and to forestall Crawford, the "heir apparent", was inevitable. The dissatisfied element in the Southern and Middle states instinctively turned to Jackson as the logical instrument for this purpose, and certainly no rôle could have been more congenial to the general than one which cast him in opposition to William H. Crawford.

The first statement that he was being definitely considered for the presidency came from Pennsylvania in 1821, where the leaders were said to have canvassed the situation and found that he was the logical man.<sup>56</sup> North Carolina followed the lead of Pennsylvania,<sup>57</sup> and word came from Virginia that the people were for Jackson, but that leadership was needed in order that the politicians be overthrown.<sup>58</sup>

The movement in Tennessee was brought to the surface in 1822 when it was proposed that the general assembly present the general's name to the nation as a suitable candidate for the presidency. The

<sup>55</sup> This had to do with a decision of the state supreme court which overruled former decisions and declared that titles to land, in order to be valid, must be connected by an unbroken chain with the original grant, and that occupiers might be ejected even though they held under color of title. The legislature added another justice to the court, and John Catron, afterward justice of the United States Supreme Court, was appointed to fill the place in order that this decision might be annulled. Jackson had a personal interest in the matter and denounced the action of the legislature. See Jackson to Coffee, April 15, and May 24, 1823, Coffee Papers. For the legal phase of the question, see Barton's *Lessee v. Shall, Tennessee Reports* (Peck), p. 172.

<sup>56</sup> S. R. Overton to Jackson, Aug. 1, 1821, Jackson Papers.

<sup>57</sup> A. D. Murphy to John H. Eaton, Jan. 16, 1824, Overton Papers.

<sup>58</sup> Thos. G. Watkins to Jackson, Mar. 13, 1822, Jackson Papers.



proposition was carried by that body without a dissenting vote.<sup>59</sup> This in the face of the fact that Jackson's candidate for the governorship had been defeated during the previous year by an overwhelming majority. This apparently conflicting vote merely shows that national and state politics were not closely related at that time. The general had been repudiated in no uncertain manner as a state politician, but as a national hero he was a success. Discredited because of his conservative stand in the state, he was chosen to lead the progressive movement in the nation.

A sidelight on the situation is afforded by an incident which occurred during the next year. Colonel John Williams, of Knoxville, had represented Tennessee in the United States Senate since 1815, and had attacked Jackson during the Seminole investigation of 1819.<sup>60</sup> His term expired in 1823, and he was up for re-election with excellent prospects of success. Jackson's friends decided that his presidential prospects would be blighted by the election of one of his bitterest enemies to the Senate from his own state, and when no other candidate could develop sufficient strength to defeat Williams, the general himself was, at the last minute, induced to run.<sup>61</sup> A number of the members of the legislature had already pledged their votes to Williams and could not change, but the ballot, when counted, stood twenty-five to thirty-five in favor of Jackson. The names of those voting were not recorded in the journal—a significant omission. Tennesseans would not permit Jackson to dictate to them, but his personal prestige was great, and there were few who dared stand against him face to face.

Jackson went to the Senate against his will. Back in 1798 he had resigned from that body after a year of uncongenial service. He was now returned to the national forum at the behest of friends who had previously devoted their best efforts to keeping him quiet. Yet it was not because he was afraid to speak his mind that he shrank from the Senate. Above all things, save perhaps a good fight, the general liked to speak his mind. That he gave in so often to his advisers shows that he was not devoid of political discretion. His real objection to Washington, as he so often stated, was its partizan intrigue. There was too much competition in the capital.

<sup>59</sup> Jackson to Dr. J. C. Bronaugh, Aug. 1, 1822, S. R. Overton to Jackson, Sept. 10, 1822, Jackson Papers; Nashville *Whig*, July 31, 1822. See also Grundy to Jackson, June 27, 1822, Jackson Papers.

<sup>60</sup> Jackson to William Williams, Sept. 25, 1819, Bassett, *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, II. 430.

<sup>61</sup> Thos. L. Williams to Overton, Sept. 10, 1823, Overton Papers. Wm. Brady and Thos. Williamson to Jackson, Sept. 20, 1823, Jackson to Brady and Williamson, Sept. 27, 1823, Jackson Papers; Jackson to Coffee, Oct. 5, 1823, Coffee Papers; Knoxville *Register*, Oct. 10, 1823.

There was no doubt but that, before the presidential election, Jackson's hand would be revealed in regard to the important questions which were agitating the country. It was a brave stand for a general in politics to take, but he took it unequivocally. He voted consistently for internal improvements and for the tariff of 1824.<sup>62</sup>

Jackson posed as a Jeffersonian, as did nearly all the Southern Republicans of his day, and in 1822 he had written to Monroe congratulating him upon the veto of the Cumberland Road bill.<sup>63</sup> Yet Tennessee needed internal improvements and ardently desired them. As late as 1825 James K. Polk advocated federal aid for such purposes.<sup>64</sup> In voting as he did in 1824, Jackson represented the interests of his constituents, but during the same year he expressed the opinion that the consent of the state should be secured before the national government should give assistance.<sup>65</sup> During 1827 his supporters in the Tennessee legislature were said to have opposed a federal aid project because of the effect that the agitation of such a question by them might have upon the presidential election in Pennsylvania and Virginia.<sup>66</sup> Finally, when the general became President, he vetoed the Maysville Road bill on the ground that the thoroughfare in question was one of only local importance. The fact was, however, that it was the main highway—an extension of the old Cumberland Road—along which the eastern mail was, at the very time, being carried to Nashville and the Southwest.<sup>67</sup>

In his stand on the tariff question in 1824, Jackson stressed the military importance of domestic manufactures, and also argued for the development of a home market for agricultural products.<sup>68</sup> In this matter he doubtless voiced his personal convictions. The home-market argument had an appeal for the grain farmers of the West, and there were more grain farmers in Tennessee than there were cotton planters, yet Jackson himself belonged to the latter group and protection was not popular with them as a class. Furthermore, despite the rise of democracy, the wealthy cotton planters still had a large share in the creation of public opinion, and there were, in Tennessee, few active advocates of a high tariff before 1840.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>62</sup> Bassett, *Jackson*, pp. 344-345.

<sup>63</sup> Jackson to Monroe, July 26, 1822, Jackson Papers.

<sup>64</sup> Phelan, *History of Tennessee*, p. 396.

<sup>65</sup> Jackson to James W. Lanier, May (?), 1824, Jackson Papers; Jackson to Polk, Dec. 4, 1826, Polk Papers.

<sup>66</sup> Knoxville *Enquirer*, Jan. 9, 1828.

<sup>67</sup> J. P. Bretz, "Early Land Communication with the Lower Mississippi Valley", in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XIII. 27-29.

<sup>68</sup> Jackson to Coffee, May 7, 1824, Jackson to John Overton, June 18, 1824, Coffee Papers; Parton, *Jackson*, III. 35-36.

<sup>69</sup> Phelan, *History of Tennessee*, p. 425.

In regard to the Bank of the United States, Jackson's views were not developed until after the period of his senatorial services. He certainly did not take a stand against that institution before 1826. In 1827 he began making unfavorable comments on it, but public opposition did not develop until after his election to the presidency.<sup>70</sup> This was clearly not a question of long-standing prejudice with him, and the evidence seems to point to Van Buren as the source of his opinions on the subject.<sup>71</sup> In addition to this, Jackson knew that most of the branches of the bank were in the hands of his opponents and had good reason to believe that their influence was used against him during the election of 1828.<sup>72</sup> It was entirely Jacksonian for him to form his opinion upon such grounds.

Jackson had once been a merchant and he was still a man of business affairs. He had long been a believer in a sound currency and the rights of the creditor. His early economic ideas were in accord with those of William Carroll, and there was nothing here to bring him into conflict with the Bank of the United States. The motives of his opposition were political, not economic.

No historian has ever accused Jackson, the great Democrat, of having had a political philosophy. It is hard to see that he even had any political principles. He was a man of action, and the man of action is likely to be an opportunist. Politically speaking, Jackson was certainly an opportunist. If he gave any real help or encouragement before 1828 to any of the movements which, under men like Carroll, aimed at the amelioration of the condition of the masses, the fact has not been recorded. He belonged to the moneyed aristocracy of Nashville, yet he was a self-made man and devoid of snobbishness. He thought he was sincere when he spoke to the people, yet he never really championed their cause. He merely encouraged them to champion his.

It seems clear that Jackson's political habits were formed in the period of the early settlement of the Southwest when a few leaders were able to shape the public mind and use their official positions as an aid to their exploitation of the land. He never failed, for instance, to use the patronage of office for the promotion of the interests of his friends. The democratic awakening which took such hold upon the people of Tennessee after the panic of 1819 failed to enlist his sympathy. He was called upon to lead the national phase of this

<sup>70</sup> Catterall, *Second Bank of the United States*, pp. 183-184.

<sup>71</sup> R. L. Colt to Biddle, Jan. 7, 1829, June 10, 1830, Henry Clay to Biddle, June 14, 1830, *The Correspondence of Nicholas Biddle*, ed. R. C. McGrane, pp. 66-67, 104, 105.

<sup>72</sup> Wm. B. Lewis to Biddle, Oct. 16, 1829, pp. 79-80, Biddle to Geo. Hoffman, Nov. 22, 1829, *ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

movement, but played no part in the formulation or promotion of its constructive programme. He did, however, in 1824, represent the needs of the West for improved commercial facilities, and he was a nationalist from early conviction. After 1824 he came under political influence—that of Van Buren, it seems, being paramount<sup>73</sup>—which caused him to change his earlier opinions in several respects. This accounts for the fact that his presidential policy favored the seaboard staple growers rather than the grain producers of the West. Yet he failed, in the main, to capture the support of the cotton planters of the South, for many of them either sympathized with nullification or desired a United States bank and internal improvements. He was a political hybrid—too strong a nationalist for some, too strong a state-rights man for others. On the other hand, he held to the end the loyalty of the small farmers, for the Jacksonian tradition was deeply rooted in them, and Jackson's bank policy looked to them like democracy. Banks often worked to their disadvantage, and they could manage without commercial facilities. They constituted the rank and file of the Democratic party in the South until the Whig organization went to pieces and the planters were thereby forced to accept, at a late date, the bait which Jackson had proffered them in vain.

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY.

<sup>73</sup> Bassett, *Jackson*, pp. 484-489; *David Crockett's Circular*, pamphlet in Library of Congress (Washington, 1831), pp. 2-5.

## NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

### RECENT SPANISH ARABIC STUDIES

It is an outstanding characteristic of the modern Spanish historical school that it frankly recognizes the importance of Arabic studies for the understanding of the Spanish civilization in its widest aspects—social, literary, theological, legal—and does not regard the Moslem dominance in Spain, with its influences, as a period to be ignored or to be got rid of as quickly as possible. It thus accepts the fact that the Spanish peninsula was one of the bridges between Islam and Christendom and sees the whole of medieval Europe as affected by the multifarious influences which passed over that bridge. This openness of mind in the Spanish school is in almost startling contrast with an obliviousness towards Islam on the part of too many Italian medievalists; the grandeurs of Rome too often blind these to the essential unity of the medieval civilization which surrounded the whole Mediterranean. One embarrassing consequence of the labors of this Spanish school is that the European medievalist must be prepared to read Spanish easily; some Arabic would be a great advantage to him but that seems to be a counsel of perfection. Every year books appear in Spain which are of importance not only for Spain but for all Europe. The Royal Spanish Academy and the Junta para Ampliación de Estudios are unwearying in their publications, and the names of the leaders of the Spanish school of Arabists, Ribera and Asín and their pupils, recur again and again on these. Thus Asín has just published, under the imprint of the Royal Academy of History, the first volume of an elaborate study of the Moslem philosopher and theologian Ibn Hazm of Cordova (*Abenházam de Córdoba y su Historia Crítica de las Ideas Religiosas*, por Miguel Asín Palacios, Madrid, 1927, pp. 346) whose discussions mark a stage in the relationship of theology and physical science and especially in the history of the atomic theory. Similarly, under the imprint of the Royal Academy of History, Julián Ribera has just published a book which has been long in the making (*Colección de Obras Árabigas de Historia y Geografía, que publica la Real Academia de la Historia*, tomo segundo, *Historia de la Conquista de España de Abenelcotia el Cordobés . . . traducción de Don Julián Ribera*, Madrid, 1926, pp. xxxii, 186, 232). In the 'sixties of the last century Pascual de Gayangos, the father of almost all the Arabists of Spain,

undertook, along with his labors on the British Museum catalogue of Spanish manuscripts, an edition of this work from the unique Paris manuscript. He completed the text, which was printed by the Spanish Academy as the second volume of their collection of Arabic works. The text bears the date 1868 but it was never issued; the sheets remained in the archives of the Academy. Now, at last, after fifty-eight years, these sheets appear with the addition by Julián Ribera of a translation, introduction, and textual emendations from a photograph of the Paris manuscript. Dozy's use of this history of the conquest long ago made plain its importance, and all students of medieval Europe must be grateful to the piety of Ribera in thus completing his master's work. A third volume, issued by the Junta para Ampliación de Estudios, deals with a later period in the eleventh century A. D., that of the little local kings who reigned most confusedly between the passing of the Umayyads and the coming of the Murabits. This period has been the despair of historians, but is at last being put on a firmer basis by the labors on the coins of those kinglets of Antonio Prieto y Vives, a civil engineer. (*Los Reyes de Taifas: Estudio Histórico-Numismático de los Musulmanes Españoles en el Siglo V. de la Hégira, XI. de J. C.*, por Antonio Prieto y Vives, ingeniero de caminos, canales, y puertos, Madrid, 1926, pp. 280; many small maps and plates of coins.) In the history of literature and of literary dependencies and sources two smaller works by Professor Emilio García Gómez of the University of Madrid are of importance (*Un Cuento Árabe Fuente Común de Abentofáil y de Gracián*, Madrid, 1926, pp. 100; *La Forêt aux Pucelles*, Madrid, 1927, pp. 24.) The first of these deals with a tangled bit of literary relationship between the philosopher Ibn Tufail, Avicenna, "El Criticón" of Gracián, and Boccaccio; the second finds an Arabic source for an episode in the Old French romance of Alexander.

D. B. MACDONALD.

#### ON COPPERING SHIP'S BOTTOMS

IN his informing and suggestive work, *Forests and Sea Power* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1926), Professor Robert Greenhalgh Albion has occasion to say something about the problem of keeping British warships in repair and of the significance of this as a factor in naval tactics and strategy. On page 11, with ample references to authorities, he takes up briefly the question of sheathing in general and of copper sheathing in particular:

Even the stronger timbers [he writes] might contain elements of decay. The timber problem was closely related to the durability of ships. Un-

satisfactory wood could produce speedy decay. This not only reduced the efficiency of the Navy, but it greatly increased the demand for timber to replace the rotten material. Decay could come from external or internal sources. The external decay was usually produced by marine borers; the internal by dry rot. One of the advantages of oak was its strong tannic or gallic acid, which was distasteful to the little *teredo navalis*, or sea-worm. In spite of this acid, these marine borers made leaky sieves of dozens of the king's ships by chewing the planking into veritable honeycombs, especially on the southern stations. Sheathing with tar, hair, and fir boards was an ineffective remedy practised for two centuries. Experiments with lead sheathing during the Restoration were not satisfactory, but the general introduction of copper sheathing into the Navy during the American Revolution finally put an end to this external decay.

A letter from the Navy Board to the Admiralty, August 31, 1763, found in the William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan, seems to fix more specifically the date at which the experiment of using copper sheathing was first undertaken. Acting under instructions from the Lords of the Admiralty, issued October 21, 1761, the Navy Board reported on the above date that "His Majesty's Ship *Alarm*, whose bottom had been covered with copper for an experiment of preserving it against the Worm", had just returned from the West Indies to Woolwich. In order to inform themselves as to how far "the Experiment had answered the intention" they had sent directions to the officers at Woolwich carefully to examine the copper plates covering the ship's bottom, to "observe the effect of the worm" and to ascertain the extent to which the copper "was clean or fouled with Barnacles, Weeds, which usually collect and grow upon the bottoms of Ships in long voyages". Passing over the technicalities in their careful and detailed account, the substance of their findings is embodied under three main heads, and a few supplementary comments.

(1) "That so long as Copper Plates can be kept upon the Bottom, the Plank will be thereby entirely secured from the Effect of the Worm."

(2) "That neither the Plank or Caulking received the least injury with respect to its duration, by being covered therewith."

(3) "That Copper bottoms are not incident to foul by weeds, or any other Cause."

"All which are advantages very desirable to be attained, provided Methods can be fallen upon to obviate the difficulties We have before pointed out; the greatest of which is the bad Effect that Copper has upon Iron." This had been particularly noticed where the plates had been fastened with iron nails, which had been done "to vary the experiment".

Their extended and painstaking study of the problem concludes as follows: "And having maturely considered all the Circumstances



that attend the Sheathing of Ships with Copper, and seeing the extension of advantages it is capable of; supposing it can be brought into use, We are induced to recommend it to their Lordships' consideration, whether a further tryal may not be made of it, with the improvements, We have mentioned." The significance attached to the recommendations made in this document is attested by a side note, added in 1777, which states: "this matter has now been brought to such perfection, that a great number of Frigates, etc. are coppered and it is found to answer extreemly well."

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

#### A MISUSED QUOTATION

The great object of Jacobinism, both in its political and moral revolution, is to destroy every trace of civilization in the world, and to force mankind back into a savage state. . . . That is, in plain English, the greatest villain in the community is the fittest person to make and execute the laws. Graduated by this scale, there can be no doubt that the Jacobins have the highest qualifications for rulers. . . . We have now reached the consummation of Democratic blessedness. We have a country governed by blockheads and knaves; the ties of marriage, with all its felicities, are severed, and destroyed; our wives and daughters are thrown into the stews; our children are cast into the world from the breast, and forgotten; filial piety is extinguished, and our surnames, the only mark of distinction among families, are abolished. Can the imagination paint anything more dreadful on this side hell?

WHEN Theodore Dwight painted this horrendous picture for the Society of the Cincinnati at New Haven, July 7, 1801, he could hardly have anticipated that almost ninety years later it would be used as an illustration of what he and his party thought of the recently inaugurated administration of Thomas Jefferson, and that in the year 1927 it would still be doing duty for the same purpose. The above quotation is taken from Mr. Henry Adams's *History of the United States* (I. 225). The present writer, without attempting any thoroughgoing search, found it used at least in part by six different historians of the period. "In the fervor of his representation", says Mr. Henry Adams, "Dwight painted what he believed was to happen as though it had actually come to pass. He and his friends at least felt no doubt of it." "Dr. Dwight poured out his wrath and fears in language so frenzied as to be almost insane", says Mr. James T. Adams, thirty-seven years later, in *New England in the Republic* (p. 231). "If a man of Dwight's distinguished position and talents could be led to such utterly unfounded outbursts as this, the tone and feelings of lesser partizans may well be imagined." Mr. James T. Adams is apparently confusing Theodore with his illus-

trious elder brother, Timothy, president of Yale, inasmuch as the younger Dwight was not a doctor and, however talented, was not in 1801 occupying any distinguished position.

It was not, however, a case of inflamed imagination anticipating impending evils, or, still less, a case of insanity.

Dwight probably regarded Democrats in general as blockheads and knaves and undoubtedly expected a long train of political and economic evils to follow their acquisition of power, an expectation which was not disappointed. An examination of the oration shows, however, that this particular description was intended to apply, not to the United States in 1801, but to that imaginary state described by William Godwin in his *Enquiry concerning Political Justice*. Godwin's book, at the opening of the nineteenth century, was rasping the emotions of conservatives in much the same manner as sundry communistic productions have recently stirred those of their descendants. They were also, apparently, quite as anxious to demonstrate that American radicalism was not an indigenous product. The Reverend Jedidiah Morse, three years earlier, had created a temporary furore by his revelation of the alleged subversive activities of the Illuminati, although failure to furnish satisfactory proof had left the reverend gentleman looking somewhat ridiculous. An exaggerated importance was therefore attached to the influence of Godwin's doctrines of equality and proposals for a remodelling of the state. The latter receive a somewhat surprising amount of attention in newspaper and pamphlet literature of the period. The lugubrious Fisher Ames, contemplating the decline of public virtue, the impending ruin of American institutions, and the pernicious influence of the French Revolution, made his dark days still darker by pondering on the evils of Godwin's model state.

In the above oration, Dwight, after commenting on the politics of the day and the lack of virtue generally prevailing outside Federalist circles, declares that "the Jacobins of this country are as malignant and as profligate as those of France", and proceeds to show what they are likely to do to existing institutions. He then proceeds: "The plan of improving society is carried much further by an English writer of celebrity, from whom our cosmopolites have drawn the most important articles of their creed. Godwin . . . has drawn a full length picture of society when men shall triumph over death, and a state of perfect Democratic equality shall exist." Under Godwin's system, he proceeds to show, certain results are inevitable. "Our rulers are to be desperate in pecuniary circumstances . . . they are to be ignorant . . . they will despise justice . . . extinguish from the breast every idea of future accountability, etc. . . . From this sketch

of the body politic, the transition is easy to the picture of private life."

Godwin's remorseless logic carried him through to an inescapable conclusion. Accepting his premises as to the nature of the state and of property rights in general, it was inevitable that he should find the family an obnoxious institution, marriage an inexcusable monopoly, and that he should end by declaring: "It is of no importance that we should be able to discover our own children." Upon this declaration his enemies fell with the same joyous abandon displayed by our own contemporaries when "the nationalization of women" was announced from Soviet Russia. "We have now reached the consummation of Democratic blessedness", said Dwight, and the rest of the quotation follows, as given at the beginning of this note. Then, after tracing the progress of an individual through life in such a society, he adds:

View, for a moment, millions of such wretches as I have described. Think of a world full of ignorance, impurity, and guilt; without justice, without science, without affection, without conjugal felicity, without parental love, without filial piety, without domestic happiness, without worship, without a prayer, without a God! Let the people of New England, and especially the people of Connecticut, enslaved and deluded as they are, contrast this Tartarean state, with their own real, and substantial blessings.

In a recent decision involving a libel, Mr. Chief Justice Taft remarked that the defendant's statements were "so excessive and outrageous in their character that they suggest the query whether their superlative vilification has not overleapt itself and become unconsciously humorous. But this is no defense". Many of those who have read Dwight's sentiments as quoted by subsequent historians would undoubtedly consider this description quite applicable. Theodore Dwight, however, although bigoted on political questions, was a man of character and ability. He hated Jefferson, Frenchmen, Democrats, demagogues, and all their works, but he had written satirical verse of some merit, attacked the institution of slavery when it was still in good standing even in New England, was an able, though decidedly abusive, journalist, and was not likely to place himself in a position where his utterances would appear "unconsciously humorous".

It is an interesting example of the manner in which an excerpt, carelessly removed from a context which is not available for examination, or likely to be examined by the ordinary reader, can for many years convey an erroneous impression of the author, and to a lesser degree, of his associates and their cause.

WILLIAM A. ROBINSON.

## STANDARD TIME IN THE UNITED STATES

STANDARD time in the United States belongs to that type of innovations whose quick acceptance has made the existence of any other order seem almost impossible. Scarcely more than a decade was necessary for the conception, development, and permanent acceptance of the idea. Once adopted, there has been almost no question as to its desirability, and few suggestions have been made for its change.

Exact sun time depends for its accuracy upon the precise measurement of longitude. One of the earliest observatories to do authoritative work in this field was that of Greenwich, England. England was a maritime nation and hence the Greenwich computations came to be used widely on maps and nautical charts. When settlements were made in America the English colonists naturally continued to use Greenwich as the prime meridian. Each settlement had its own independent time except as some of the outlying districts used the times of their nearest large neighbors for purposes of convenience.

As long as travel was comparatively slight the variation in time was not important. Packets that left with the tide, and stages which were many times hours late, made time a minor matter. With the arrival of the railroads, however, fast and punctual service was introduced, which necessitated a closer agreement of time than had ever before been necessary. A road such as the New York Central found it extremely awkward to have its trains arrive at Buffalo fifteen minutes late by local time, while the times of connecting roads might vary still more. Each road ran by the time of its terminal city, which never agreed with the time of any other large city.<sup>1</sup>

Not only was the situation bad, but there were almost no precedents for its improvement. Until the latter eighteen-seventies the only nation which had taken any action was England, which had adopted Greenwich time January 13, 1848, for the official use of the entire nation. Obviously such a plan would not work in the United States. It was perfectly evident that New York or Washington time would be ridiculous in Chicago and worse than useless in San Francisco, except as a purely arbitrary train time, while the use of a central point as a standard would be only slightly less preposterous.

The first man to advance prominently a proposal for time reform was Professor C. F. Dowd, principal of the Temple Grove Seminary for young ladies at Saratoga Springs, New York. By means of correspondence, pamphlets, articles, interviews, and speeches he suc-

<sup>1</sup> A list of the time standards in use in 1883 may be found in *Proceedings of the American Railway Association*, I. 701.

ceeded in interesting many railroad executives all over the country. By 1873 his plans had matured sufficiently to enable him to obtain signatures to an agreement which provided for the introduction of standard time as soon as a majority of the executives of the country had agreed. The new time was to be based on a zone arrangement, with an hour's difference between zones. Unfortunately the panic of 1873 ended Professor Dowd's plans by giving the railroads more important troubles about which to worry.<sup>2</sup>

While Professor Dowd was working toward an ideal solution of the time problem, the railroads themselves were trying in an exceedingly practical way to obviate some of the worst difficulties of the situation. Starting with a meeting in 1872<sup>3</sup> the roads held periodic gatherings in order to prepare time-tables which would provide good connections for all through trains.<sup>4</sup> The success of these meetings is attested by the development of a permanent body (the General Time Convention) which held regular semi-annual meetings from 1876 on.

By the middle 'seventies many influential persons in both railroad and scientific circles had become interested in the idea of standard time, and such societies as the American Meteorological Society, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the Society of Civil Engineers had committees for its study. A very complete report on the matter, presented in 1879 to the American Meteorological Society by Professor Cleveland Abbe and Mr. F. B. Elliott, provided a prolific source of discussion among all interested parties.<sup>5</sup>

Both the Dowd and the Abbe-Elliott plans were based upon a division of the country into zones, each to be one hour apart. While this general concept seemed most acceptable, certain other people had different ideas. Some wished to use a single time as an arbitrary standard for through trains all over the country.<sup>6</sup> Others divided the railroads into groups which might use times varying 30 minutes, 45 minutes, etc., from Washington.<sup>7</sup> The one thing to which every-

<sup>2</sup> Professor Dowd's work is described and evaluated in *Railroad Gazette*, Nov. 16, 1883, XV. 756, and Jan. 25, 1884, XVI. 68; *Proceedings of the Am. Rwy. Ass.*, I. 702; *Railway Age*, Jan. 10, 1884, IX. 25, and Feb. 7, 1884, IX. 86.

<sup>3</sup> *Proceedings of the Am. Rwy. Ass.*, I. 681.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 681-682.

<sup>5</sup> The report is given in *Proceedings of the Am. Rwy. Ass.*, I. 682-684; comments appear in *Railway Age*, May 26, 1881, VI. 291, and *Railroad Gazette*, Nov. 4, 1881, XIII. 612; the last-named reference includes a reprint of the report.

<sup>6</sup> See the proposal of John Waterhouse, C. E., in *Railroad Gazette*, Oct. 26, 1877, IX. 473; the editorial proposal, *ibid.*, Jan. 28, 1881, XIII. 53-54; the proposal of F. F. Newberry, C. E., *ibid.*, Aug. 26, 1881, XIII. 463-464; and *Proceedings of the Am. Rwy. Ass.*, I. 684-687.

<sup>7</sup> H. S. Haines in *Railroad Gazette*, Jan. 12, 1883, XV. 21.

one agreed was that local time could not be displaced for local use. Elaborate diagrams pictured how the old and the new time could be indicated on one watch or clock.<sup>8</sup>

The growth in railroad and scientific circles of an interest in standard time met with no response in the legislative assemblies of the country.<sup>9</sup> The only real possibility of action seemed to be through the railroads, and here the body most interested was the General Time Convention. In 1881 that convention took cognizance of a communication on standard time from the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and appointed Mr. W. F. Allen as a committee of one to report upon the matter.<sup>10</sup> Mr. Allen was editor of the *Traveler's Guide* and an outstanding advocate of standard time, so that his appointment in itself gave an indication that the convention was disposed to be friendly.

Mr. Allen's final report was presented in April, 1883, and concluded from an examination of the facts that the zone system of the Dowd and Abbe-Elliott plans was the best solution. It added to previous discussions by showing specifically how a system of standard time would work on the railroads. The important times, such as those of New York and Chicago, were already approximately one hour apart, so that little change would be necessary to use the times of 75°, 90°, etc. A colored map showed that these zones would correspond very well with the divisional arrangement of the railroads. The report also broke new ground in expressing the hope that the new standard would become universal in its use.<sup>11</sup>

In accordance with Mr. Allen's report the convention adopted resolutions accepting the proposed plan as follows: (1) roads using Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Toronto, Hamilton, or Washington time should take that of 75° or Eastern Time; (2) roads using Columbus, Atlanta, Cincinnati, Louisville, Indianapolis, Chicago, St. Louis, Jefferson City, St. Paul, or Kansas City time should take that of 90° or Central Time, which would be one hour slower; (3) lines further west were to use the times of 105° and 120°, which would be two and three hours slower than Eastern

<sup>8</sup> There was also some support for the twenty-four-hour day, as well as for a ten-hour day with divisions based upon the decimal system. See references under foot-note 6.

<sup>9</sup> *Congressional Record*, 47 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 2388, 2793, 4284, 4555, 5204.

<sup>10</sup> *Proceedings of the Am. Rwy. Ass.*, I. 682-684; *Railroad Gazette*, Nov. 4, 1881, XIII. 612.

<sup>11</sup> The report is given in full in *Proceedings of the Am. Rwy. Ass.*, I. 690-692; *Railroad Gazette*, Apr. 20, 1883, XV. 241-242, 251, and Apr. 27, 1883, XV. 270; *Railway Age*, Apr. 19, 1883, VIII. 214-215, 219, and Oct. 11, 1883, VIII. 638-639. The last two references give also editorial comment.

Time; (4) all changes of time were to be of one hour and were to take place at the end of a line or at a division point.<sup>12</sup>

The above resolutions included, by amendment, the names of all the roads in each group; the time for the change was left blank until the secretary could ascertain the reaction of all the roads. By October, 1883, Mr. Allen was able to present a list of 188 roads (over 78,000 miles of line) which favored the project without qualifications. In accordance with this information the convention voted that the new time and corresponding time-schedules go into effect on November 18, 1883. The only roads to vote against this resolution were the Michigan Central and two of its satellites.<sup>13</sup>

The installation of standard time occurred rapidly and smoothly. A few roads hesitated, but even these joined by the end of the year.<sup>14</sup> Not only the railroads, but the country at large accepted the new time. Seventy of the hundred largest cities of the United States adopted it at once, and others soon followed.<sup>15</sup> Individual towns and states put the new time into law; elsewhere it was accepted by common usage. Congress adopted it for the District of Columbia in March, 1884,<sup>16</sup> but did not act on a national scale until the recent war, when it recognized standard time in the act to establish daylight-saving time.<sup>17</sup>

The adoption of standard time occurred in general with remarkable ease, but here and there was some opposition. An ordinance in favor of the new time was vetoed by A. Dogberry, mayor of Bangor, Maine, on the grounds that it was unconstitutional, being an attempt to change the immutable law of God, not desired by the people, and hard on the workingman by changing day into night. Columbus, Ohio, and Fort Wayne, Indiana, also delayed accepting the new time because of its effects on the workingman. From the other side it

<sup>12</sup> *Proceedings of the Am. Rwy. Ass.*, I. 690; *Railroad Gazette*, Apr. 13, 1883, XV. 237.

<sup>13</sup> The report of this meeting is in *Proceedings of the Am. Rwy. Ass.*, I. 693-699; *Railroad Gazette*, Oct. 19, 1883, XV. 685; *Railway Age*, Oct. 18, 1883, VIII. 654, 665-666. There was also a Southern Railway Time Convention which held separate meetings and approved all the actions taken by the General Time Convention. The two bodies united in 1886 and assumed the name of American Railway Association in 1891. After the adoption of standard time such matters as train signals, car rules, train movements, and safety appliances became of greatest interest.

<sup>14</sup> *Proceedings of the Am. Rwy. Ass.*, I. 702-703; *Railway Age*, Nov. 15, 1883, VIII. 722, and Nov. 22, 1883, VIII. 743; *Commercial and Financial Chronicle*, Nov. 17, 1883, XXXVII. 523-525; *Railroad Gazette*, Nov. 12, 1883, XV. 677, 682, and Nov. 23, 1883, XV. 778.

<sup>15</sup> *Proceedings of the Am. Rwy. Ass.*, I. 703. Special efforts were made to secure the adherence of New York City.

<sup>16</sup> *U. S. Statutes at Large*, XXIII. 4 (Mar. 13, 1884).

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. XL., pt. I., pp. 450, 451 (Mar. 19, 1918).



was contended by some of the manufacturers that in certain cases it meant more artificial light in the short days.<sup>18</sup>

The adoption of standard time in the United States at once raised the question of its co-ordination with the rest of the world. As early as May, 1882, before the railroads had acted, Congress had resolutions before it in both Senate and House requesting the President to call an international conference to recommend an international prime meridian for the reckoning of both longitude and time.<sup>19</sup> After a short and perfunctory debate the measure was enacted;<sup>20</sup> with this authority the State Department approached other governments and finally called the conference to meet in Washington on October 1, 1884.

The conference met as scheduled, including England, France, and Germany among the twenty-seven nations represented. Mr. W. F. Allen and Professor Cleveland Abbe were members of the United States delegation of five. The most interesting part of the discussions proved to be a strenuous effort on the part of the French delegation to avoid resolutions favoring an international prime meridian which would be defined by an English place. In spite of these objections the conference placed itself on record as favoring Greenwich as the world prime meridian. It also advocated a universal twenty-four hour day and the application of the decimal system to measurements of both time and space. The proposals of Mr. Allen for a more practical application of standard time on a world scale were not considered.<sup>21</sup>

The ultimate results of the conference were negligible, since its recommendations were not acted upon by the various governments. A concurrent resolution was passed by the United States Senate in 1885 asking the other nations to act, but the measure was never brought before the House.<sup>22</sup> In 1888 President Cleveland sent a note to Congress asking that action be taken on the report of the conference, but no attention was ever paid to the subject.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>18</sup> For evidence of this opposition see *Railroad Gazette*, Nov. 23, 1883, XV. 778, and Feb. 8, 1884, XVI. 101; *Railway Age*, Nov. 29, 1883, VIII. 753, Dec. 6, 1883, VIII. 769, Dec. 13, 1883, VIII. 786-787, Mar. 13, 1884, IX. 164, and Aug. 28, 1884, IX. 543.

<sup>19</sup> In House—*Cong. Record*, 47 Cong., 1 sess., p. 3812; in Senate—*ibid.*, p. 3926. It was the former which finally passed both Houses.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 5304, 5689-5690, 5684, 6168, 6592-6593, 6904. *U. S. Statutes at Large*, XXII. 217 (Aug. 3, 1882). It was slightly amended in the appropriation bill of July 7, 1884. *Ibid.*, XXIII. 194.

<sup>21</sup> The full report of the proceedings of the conference is given in *House Exec. Doc.* 14, 48 Cong., 2 sess.

<sup>22</sup> *Cong. Rec.*, 48 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 1380, 1449.

<sup>23</sup> *House Exec. Doc.* 61, 50 Cong., 1 sess., vol. 25, no. 61.

In spite of the failure of international action to secure worldwide standard time, the idea was gradually put into practice. Nearly all of the countries of Europe, including France, eventually accepted the Greenwich standard and the zone system. The only exceptions are those countries which use the time of some national city, and even in these cases the time has been standardized for the nation.

The adoption of standard time in the United States involved several factors which were quite significant. In the first place it was carried on by private initiative—a condition which was unique to the United States, and indicative of a somewhat typical national attitude. In the second place, the adoption of standard time was an indication of the increasing national unity which was becoming evident during the period. Lastly, the international conference was one of the early cases in which the United States admitted the importance of international action as affecting the internal affairs of the nation.

ROBERT E. RIEGEL.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

*Social Factors in Medical Progress.* By BERNHARD J. STERN, Ph.D.  
[Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, edited by the  
Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, no. 287.]  
(New York: Columbia University Press. 1927. Pp. 136.  
\$2.25.)

THIS volume has all the merits and few of the defects attaching to writings on medicine by the non-medical. The title is too comprehensive, for the book is really the attempt of a trained sociologist to explain the antagonisms to worthwhile medical discoveries in terms of his science. Apart from a few trifling slips and misprints, the handling is terse, accurate, effective, even brilliant, and of a commendable brevity. If the author misses the essential viewpoint of the physician, it must be admitted that this is seldom realized except by serious practitioners within the enclave which is bedside medicine. In the opening chapter the sociological moments of inertia are clearly stated, *e.g.*, personal prestige as a "vested interest", ignorance, misoneism, power of tradition, might of acquired behavioristic patterns, fear and snobbery as mental inability to cope with the unknown or unusual, inoculation of undue reverence for authority by false educational methods, mechanical difficulties in diffusing knowledge, bizarre personal traits in the innovator, and so on. Elsie Parsons stated the *n*-dimensional formula, both for savage and *civilisé*, as "habit, buttressed by economic, legal, religious, moral . . . constraints". We are creatures of habit, afflicted, like the gums and colloids, with "passive resistance to change". In the next chapter, the professional psychology of the physician is analyzed with reference to these data. It may be summarized in the observation of one of the most intelligent of American women: "Doctors are as conservative as Kings." A physician of sound sense, once buncoed by commercialized drugs, the confusional status of medical doctrine, or the senseless proliferation of inferior medical literature, is apt to follow Davy Crockett's sage precept or the *méfiez-vous* (μέμνησο ἀπιστεῖν) of the Greek philosopher or the *Nichevo* of the Russians. An exception is the known credulity of physicians in financial speculations, which Osler paralleled with the credulity of financiers in relation to quacks and quack medicines. Even the greatest physicians, however, may turn bigots on occasion, sometimes from "inadequate ideas" (Spinoza), sometimes from subconscious professional jealousy ("catch me advertising him"), sometimes from settled aversion to change. Virchow opposed Darwinism and serology. Holmes was perse-

cuted. Semmelweis was driven insane by the orthodox obstetricians. Even Osler was at first sceptical about the bacterial theory of infection and the possibilities of opening the chest in phthisis. But here, as stated, the author has overlooked the fundamental moment of inertia, *viz.*, the ethical vow of the physician, the *non nocere* of Hippocrates. The doctor is at the bedside, not to turn the patient into a laboratory animal nor to tattle about him, but to get him well, if he can; failing that, to alleviate suffering, to comfort, advise, and console, sometimes by the effect of his personality. This was the chief glory of the old-time family doctor, whose likeness to a family solicitor is not realized either by the sanitarian or the laboratory worker in experimental medicine.

The next seven chapters deal with the history of opposition to dissection, to percussion of the chest (Auenbrugger), to vaccination (Jenner), to the prevention of puerperal infection (Holmes, Semmelweis), to Pasteur, Lister, and von Bergmann (aseptic surgery). The most original and effective chapter is that on vaccination, which makes one regret that opposition to vivisection was not also considered. The tragicomic in these episodes is that science actually thrives upon opposition, but the human prime-movers are first martyred, then canonized as essential heroes. It is, of course, a mistake to infer that Servetus was burned for his correct view of the pulmonary circulation. The lesser heresy against Galen was as nothing by comparison with possible disaffection in Calvin's community as an overwhelming political motive. Again Lister was opposed in part because he did not live in Harley Street and because consultants were forbidden to see their own patients in his surgical clinic. The author's view of medical history as "mainly biographical" is naïve with reference to the initial phases of an undeveloped subject, just in process of becoming "scientific". The arid rubbing in of sociologic data, at the end of each of his chapters, suggests dreadful possibilities, were the subject entirely in the hands of laymen. The volume concludes with valuable dated tabulations, illustrating Weir Mitchell's dictum: "The success of a discovery depends upon the time of its appearance." All in all, a most readable and informing book.

F. H. GARRISON.

*Handbuch der Altarabischen Altertumskunde.* Herausgegeben von Dr. DITLEF NIELSEN in Verbindung mit Geheimrat F. Hommel und Professor N. Rhodokanakis, mit Beiträgen von Professor Adolf Grohmann und Geheimrat Enno Littmann. Band I., *Die Altarabische Kultur*. (Copenhagen: Arnold Busck. 1927. Pp. viii, 272.)

THIS is an undertaking to be heartily welcomed. No important part of the ancient world remains hidden in such obscurity, for all but a very few initiated experts, as does Arabia; and even for these experts its abundant evidence is only laboriously accessible. Published and unpub-

lished, that evidence is scattered in museums, proceedings, and journals. Far too much of it is still unpublished and unstudied, and, at the most, half a dozen men alive know it in its fullness. For it is very full; thousands of inscriptions and remains, archaeological and architectural, have been already recorded and transcribed, and thousands more must remain still untouched. The deserts and mountains of southern Arabia have faithfully guarded their own and preserved the records of an ancient civilization committed to their charge. And it is plain that that civilization if not one of the most ancient was one of the first importance in the earlier world. Those of Mesopotamia and the Nile may antedate it, but, for at least two millenia before Christ—the period on which the Hebrew records are now slowly coming back to their own—south Arabia was one of the weightiest determining factors. It is more than strange, then, that the access to these records should, for so long, have been so difficult. The difficulty has not lain either in the script or the language of these inscriptions; they have none of the obscurity of the records of either Egypt or Assyria. Sheer unhappiness of fate seems to have pushed them aside, until now, at last, the pressure of unsolved and apparently otherwise insoluble problems elsewhere in the history of the ancient world has forced a reconsidering of this neglected corner. So to all appearances the time is ripe for this thesaurus on old Arabia. The history of Egypt and of Mesopotamia is fairly clear; that of northern Syria and of the related powers in Asia Minor is moving into the light; connection has been made with ancient Greece both in the Mediterranean and in Asia Minor; the beginnings of the Hebrews are again pointing to the desert; Arabian influence upon Muhammad, in much later times, is again being suggested. The influence of Arabia through all these centuries must be taken seriously by the historian.

This first volume contains an introduction to the whole subject by Dr. Nielsen (pp. 1–56); an outline of history of South Arabia by Fritz Hommel (pp. 57–108); a short study of public institutions—constitutional, social, legal, religious, agricultural—in the same by N. Rhodokanakis (pp. 109–142); architecture, arts, and crafts by Adolf Grohmann (pp. 143–176); old Arabian religion by Dr. Nielsen (pp. 177–250); seven elaborate indexes (pp. 251–272).

Volumes II. and III. are to contain the most important inscriptions with translation, commentary, vocabulary, and grammar. So far there are 76 illustrations, all excellently reproduced. The two chapters in this volume by Dr. Nielsen himself, and especially the long one on religion, stand out in importance and interest. They are not merely historical but reach into our own world, affecting our understanding of the Old Testament, the beginnings of Christian theology, and the Koran. Finally, it is greatly to be hoped that the selection of inscriptions will be full. Such an abiding basis for long years of further study is imperatively needed. In that connection it may be worth while to draw attention to the short grammar of South Arabic recently published by Ignazio Guidi in volume XXXIX. of *Le Muséon*; also separately.

D. B. MACDONALD.

*The Cambridge Ancient History.* Edited by J. B. BURY, F.B.A., S. A. COOK, Litt.D., F. E. ADCOCK, M.A. Volume V., *Athens*. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. xxii, 554. 21 s.)

THE fifth volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History* is saner and more conservative and scholarly than the fourth with its hazardous reconstructions of the campaigns in the Persian wars, its dating of the battle of Marathon in 491 instead of 490, and its disregard of Herodotus as a trustworthy source, when there is really no other good one except a few inscriptions. In the historical chapters of this volume Thucydides is considered an incomparable historical genius and is used throughout as the main source of information. Chapter X. on the Athenian Expedition to Sicily is little more than a paraphrase of the famous narrative in the sixth and seventh books of Thucydides, based with precision and completeness on autopsy. It is especially interesting to see that inscriptional sources also have been consulted and that the articles of Meritt and West on the tribute assessments have been utilized. The result is the best history of fifth-century Athens which has yet been published.

In the present volume Greece occupies the centre of the picture, but the title "Athens, 478-401 B. C.," is given because the political and intellectual activities of Athens are the main subject of the history of the fifth century. In commerce as in thought the Athenians after their victory over the Barbarians were ready to take the heritage of Ionia as well as to challenge the hegemony of Sparta. So the volume opens with a chapter on the economic background of the fifth century by Marcus N. Tod. Here is a good discussion, condensed into only thirty-two pages, of the economic conditions under which Athens made herself the leader of Greek civilization. Population, agriculture and industry, commerce, cost of living, money, wages, interest, and public finance are some of the topics treated in a masterly fashion with a knowledge of the epigraphical as well as of the literary, archaeological, and numismatic evidence.

The main theme of the political history of the fifth century is how Athens acquired and then lost her empire. E. M. Walker writes in chapters II.-IV. the story of the rise of Athenian imperialistic democracy from a free alliance in the Confederacy of Delos when Cimon was "one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of Athenian commanders". It might have been better to have started a new chapter with the transfer of the treasury to Athens in 454, when the quota-lists start, rather than with 445 B. C., but chapter IV. on the Periclean Democracy gives a good idea of Ephialtes's reform of the Areopagus, the admission of the Zeugitae to the archonship, the payment for jurors and the restriction of the franchise, the changes in Athenian society, the rise of the demagogues, and the political effect of the courts of law. In chapter V. follows a study of the Attic Drama by J. T. Sheppard with a fine interpretation of the plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and Aristophanes, in which a sound tradition had saved tragedy from journalism. Among translations of

separate plays of Aeschylus (p. 503) I miss especially those of the *Agamemnon* by Browning and Fitzgerald and to the bibliography should be added at least the books of Norwood on Greek tragedy. Archaeologists would not agree with the statement that the action took place "partly on a stylobate or terrace which connected the two wings of the stage-building, and to which the central door behind, and probably steps from the orchestra in front, gave access to the actor" (p. 121).

In chapter VI. we turn to western Greece and read in an account of Sicily, based on Diodorus, how the brilliant tyranny declined and was supplanted by uninspired democracies in contrast to the dazzling democracy of Athens. In chapter VII. we return to Greece and have the Breakdown of the Thirty Years' Peace (445-431 B. C.). The unyielding policy of Pericles was bound to lead Athens to war but unfortunately Pericles did not live to see it through. The Parthenon was probably not finished in 435-434 (p. 177), but in 432. The Propylaea was never finished, since the work was stopped in 432 by war. The first stage of this war which most histories call the Peloponnesian War is entitled the "Archidamian War" (431-421 B. C.). This is the subject of chapter VIII., composed like the preceding chapter by one of the editors, F. E. Adcock. Chapters IX.-XII. are by our own American professor of ancient history at Harvard, W. S. Ferguson, who gives a scholarly treatment of Sparta and the Peloponnese (based chiefly on Thucydides), the Athenian Expedition to Sicily, the Oligarchical Movement in Athens, and the Fall of the Athenian Empire (the last two chapters based on Xenophon and Diodorus). The Hermae or Herms were not all "busts of Hermes, carved on square pillars of stone", as stated (p. 286). Any square pillar with any head on top was called a Herm.

Another of the editors, J. B. Bury, whose recent death is a great blow to classical scholarship and to this series of historical volumes, writes in chapter XIII., the Age of Illumination, on the sophists and blasphemy trials. He gives a detailed picture of the life and last hours and death of Socrates. Chapter XIV. by R. W. Macan puts Herodotus and Thucydides *vis-à-vis*, discusses their anthropological aspects, historical methods, artistic values, and sources and ends with the two great historians *dos-à-dos*, a most interesting and scholarly twenty pages.

In the concluding chapter Professor Beazley resumes the subject of Greek Art and D. S. Robertson that of Greek Architecture. Unfortunately the plates are in a separate volume which has not yet appeared, so that it is difficult at times to follow the text. But Professor Beazley writes in a fresh original style (quite different from that of the rest of the book) with brilliant word-pictures such as "the big flash kore of 682", "in the great beast pediments or in Tricorpor", "each man trained to the last ounce", "Heracles, himself tense as a drawn bow". Only a master of English as well as of art could speak of the Panaitius painter as a "master of careering movement", of Macron as "enamoured of the warm swing of women's clothes", or say that "the beauty of Olympia grows



stern and lunar beside the Parthenon, where one pediment is a blaze of noonday splendour and the other glows with the swelling fires of dawn", or that the "style of the Meidias painter ravishes us into a rotating heaven of sweetfleshed women with golden names, and moonwhite Erotes with golden wings". It is not certain that the new name "temple of Aphaia", given to the Doric temple on Aegina, is correct, and it is hardly true that some of the columns and capitals of the temple of Artemis at Sardis date from the fifth century B. C. Nor is it likely, as stated (p. 460), that the proscenium of the theatre at Priene became a stage in the second century B. C. For town-planning a reference to Haverfield's *Ancient City-Planning* would be better for English readers than Gerkan's book.

The notes on points especially of chronology, the maps, chronological tables, plans of temples, bibliographies, and indexes are extremely appropriate and useful. It would be easy to add to the bibliographies but the essential works are cited, though one would wish that Müller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* were cited as *F. H. G.* and not as *F. G. H.* (p. 168) and that Rostovtzeff was not spelt Rostortzeff (p. 489) and Keramopoulos printed as Keramopollos (p. 519). Flickinger's *Greek Theatre* is cited, page 505, in the second edition, and on page 529 in the first edition of 1918, whereas there is a third edition. On the other hand some books, such as Stevens and Paton's *Erechtheum*, which have not yet appeared, are cited, though Highbarger's *Megara* is not yet known. Nor is there mention of Walston's book on Alcamenas where is pictured the Cyrene head of Zeus which is a much better reflection of Phidias's Zeus than the Boston head mentioned by Beazley.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

*L'Impérialisme Macédonien et l'Hellénisation de l'Orient.* Par P. JOUGUET, Professeur à l'Université de Paris. [L'Évolution de l'Humanité, dirigée par Henri Berr.] (Paris: La Renaissance du Livre. 1926. Pp. xxii, 494. 30 fr.)

THIS volume is one of a series devoted to a vast theme—the evolution of humanity; and the first task set, one for which the editor M. Berr and the author M. Jouguet have a joint responsibility, was to select from the history of the epoch to which the volume was to be devoted the features that were at once salient and the most persistent. This epoch is the one commonly labelled Hellenistic, and it is one in which M. Jouguet has already attested his special competence by several important studies. The aspects of it presented to us as most significant are those specified in the title. We have no quarrel with the choice, though Freeman would doubtless have selected Greek Federalism instead of one of them and Mommsen would probably have entitled the other (with less accuracy) the Orientalizing of Greece. But is a study of Macedonian imperialism complete which begins with Alexander's conquest of the Persian Empire and leaves Philip's conquest of Greece to the editor's introductory note? It seems to us that the first chapter of part I. of this book is missing, with-

held for another volume of the series doubtless. The phase of Macedonian imperialism revealed or concealed in the covenant of the Hellenic League of 338/7 (303/2) B.C. is by no means the least deserving of our attention to-day. Perhaps it has been omitted here because it lacked one of the elements of later Macedonian imperialism regarded by M. Jouguet as essential, a monarchy autocratic by divine right.

In dealing with Alexander the emphasis is laid by M. Jouguet, in chapters remarkable alike for clarity and for eloquence, on ideas and organization rather than on warfare, and much space is devoted to a survey of the physical, ethnic, and political subdivisions of the world which the great conqueror dreamed of animating with a vital sense of its common humanity. As it happens, the same ground is covered by Berve in his *Alexanderreich* and Tarn in the sixth volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, and the student will do well to read the three works in conjunction. Each has its value, the German for its various theses, the English for its eminent sense for realities, the French for its multiple syntheses. In one particular M. Jouguet seems to us to be the least happy of the three—in his interpretation of deification of rulers. To him this is essentially an Oriental institution; and the fact that Alexander “n’avait pas attendu d’avoir pris contact avec l’absolutisme mystique de l’Orient pour se croire le descendant de Zeus” is written off by the affirmation made again and again that the Persian Empire was saturated with the doctrine of the divine right of kings. Like Berve, but unlike Tarn, he holds that Alexander believed that he was really a god, “il est allé jusqu’ à tirer une religion de son orgueil”. The constitutional aspects of deification are nowhere appreciated, and even in the “Post-scriptum” (p. 502), where acknowledgment is made that the Hellenic roots of the institution have been insufficiently emphasized in the text, its political motivation in Greek theory is not alluded to.

Alexander gets part I. Parts II., III., and IV. are entitled, “Le Démembrement de l’Empire”, “La Rivalité des Puissances”, and “L’Hellenisation de l’Orient”. The dependence of all history on its sources of information inevitably makes Egypt figure disproportionately in the story. On the controversial point as to the central aim of Ptolemaic policy M. Jouguet agrees neither with Rostovtzeff in making dominion abroad a means to security for the dynasty at home nor with Wilcken in making possession of Egypt a means to hegemony in the eastern Mediterranean. The dynasty, he thinks, was primarily solicitous for its position in Egypt, but the scale of its transmarine enterprises discloses an ambition on the part of at least the first two Ptolemies to acquire an empire for its own sake, “l’hégémonie dans le monde” in fact. M. Jouguet is sensible to the complexities of political motives and situations. The greatest difficulty of the modern historian of this period arises from the almost total lack of guidance from his ancient predecessors in furnishing a framework of general points of view in which to set with confidence and precision the materials made available in daily increasing abundance by the

discovery and study of papyri, parchments, stones, and coins. Arrian is too early, Polybius too late, Plutarch too episodic, and Justin too ignorant. M. Jouguet avoids with dexterity the Scylla of *a priori* reasoning without falling into the Charybdis of unrelated flotsam and jetsam. He has studied with care the constructions of his modern predecessors, as both text and bibliography attest, but he preserves his independence throughout. We should like to note as valid his thought that the West rather than the East was the area into which in its own interest Hellas should have been directed by the Macedonians, that the Greeks in the fourth and third centuries B.C. followed unwisely the line of least resistance and by exhausting themselves in Asia became less equal to the inevitable struggle with Rome. Notable, too, is his concept of the rôle in the diffusion of civilization of the Hellenized natives: "cette population mixte, dont nous avons observé l'existence et l'importance en Égypte, et sans laquelle il y aurait bien eu des Grecs établis en Asie, mais non pas une hellénisation de l'Asie" (p. 435). This is a new light in which to set the type exemplified in nomenclature at least by a certain Simon who was called Peter. The book has an index. The leaden sediment of foot-notes is related to the appended bibliography in a way that is perhaps least distracting to the general reader and most inconvenient to scholars.

W. S. FERGUSON.

*Le Monde Romain.* Par VICTOR CHAPOT, Professeur à l'École des Beaux-Arts, Chargé de Conférences à l'École des Hautes Études. [L'Évolution de l'Humanité, dirigée par Henri Berr.] (Paris: La Renaissance du Livre. 1927. Pp. xv, 503. 30 fr.)

PROFESSOR VICTOR CHAPOT was a co-author a few years ago with Cagnat of a work on Roman archaeology in two volumes. His knowledge of new and interesting material, as shown in those volumes, raised a hope that he would have utilized much of it in the historical work here under review. But one's hopes are not entirely justified. M. Chapot was writing his volume at the same time that Rostovtzeff was writing his *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*; he hit upon the same plan as did Rostovtzeff in treating the Roman world by provinces, but because of the nature of the case was not able to use so much archaeological evidence.

*Le Monde Romain* was written to order. It is one of the twenty-six volumes announced for a popular French series under the section-title of Prehistory, Protohistory, and Antiquity. The material is divided into three parts; the book carries twelve maps and two plates of selected coins; the paper is of a very inferior quality.

The author's bibliography (pp. 485-492), with 38 periodicals, 10 books of general reference, and 174 books, is long and good enough to guarantee a wide acquaintance with his field. It may be noted that he lists six American, seven Italian, eighteen British, fifty-five German, and sixty

French authors in his bibliography of books, and that he refers to Momm-  
sen-Marquardt in the French translation.

If the author has any particular theme that runs unbrokenly through his book, it is the same as that which the majority of our ancient historians these past two decades have used; namely, that the theme-key to the first four centuries of the Christian era is not *Roma*, but *Orbis Romanus*. In following that theme Professor Chapot has reconstituted the regional life and made comparative deductions from the differences or likenesses in survivals, of the character of local genius or accomplishments.

In eighty-five pages the author deals simply and satisfactorily with Roman expansion and its vicissitudes, devoting five chapters to (1) the period before the civil wars (146-96 B.C.), (2) the military dictatorships (96-31), (3) Augustus (31 B.C.-14 A.D.), (4) the end of conquest (14-117 A.D.), and (5) consolidation and defensive precautions and measures. He then gives four chapters (pp. 87-134) to the elucidation of the means of defense, to the finances of the government, and to the body-politic both municipal and provincial. Here we find nothing novel. It is a straightforward bit of somewhat uninteresting narrative.

It is in the third part of his book, "La Vie Régionale", that the author has used rather more of the material which is his own. One chapter in this part deals with Italy itself; eleven chapters deals with what may be called provincial entities. Four of these chapters contain the real meat of the book. They are two to four times as long as are the other chapters, and they contain matter of prime interest. These chapters are: VII., Syria-Palestine (33 pp.), VIII., Egypt (56 pp.), IX., the Gauls and the German Frontier (53 pp.), and XII., the Latin Provinces of Africa (33 pp.).

In his Conclusion, Professor Chapot does what all writers on ancient history do. He moralizes a bit, and even philosophizes, following Montesquieu in the main. He asks whether we should regret the downfall of Roman power; whether the subjugated nations received satisfactory compensations for their lost liberties under the widely heralded *Pax Romana*. He balances the benefits and the malefits until the scale of the former seems to show somewhat the heavier weight; but although some provinces undoubtedly were the gainers, Gaul, in having its indigenous *celtisme* throttled by Rome, clearly is not what it might have been.

R. V. D. MAGOFFIN.

*Les Institutions Politiques Romaines, de la Cité à l'État.* Par LÉON HOMO. [L'Évolution de l'Humanité, dirigée par Henri Berr.] (Paris: La Renaissance du Livre. 1927. Pp. xvi, 471. 30 fr.)

THE aim of the series L'Évolution de l'Humanité is by this time too well known to need description. The subject of the volume before us is the constitutional history of Rome from the founding of the city to the

age of Constantine. The political history has already been told in two previous volumes of the series: *L'Italie Primitiv et les Débuts de l'Impérialisme Romain* by Homo (1925) and *Le Monde Romain* by Victor Chapot (1927).

The first half of the story is excellently told. Homo has succeeded in doing what no previous writer on Roman constitutional history has ever yet done; he has made his account of Rome's early constitutional development human and readable. The treatment is concrete. The circumstances, political, social, and economic, underlying each constitutional change are vividly described. At the same time the influence of personalities is not neglected. Appius Claudius, Gaius Flaminius, Scipio Africanus, and Cato the Censor are made living figures. Extended extracts from the sources (in translation) are employed as texts on which to base the discussion of important points. Homo's gift of epigrammatic generalization enables him frequently to sum up a whole movement or period in an unforgettable sentence or two. In this part of the book Homo is traversing territory with which he is intimately acquainted. He has long been known as a specialist in Roman archaeology, and the studies preparatory to his recent book on the political history of the period have left him with a fresh recollection of the literary source-material. He therefore writes with an air of assurance. Some will complain that he writes with too much assurance; that he describes the origins of the Roman constitution and of the plebs in as confident terms as if he were describing the formation of the Third French Republic or the rise of the modern industrial proletariat. The reader receives no hint that his account of the evolution of the *concilium plebis* into the *comitia tributa* rests upon a series of conjectures. But we must remember that Homo is writing a book for popular consumption, and that he would forfeit the reader's interest were he to turn aside to justify every assertion and rebut every opposing view. Few scholars, we fancy, will approve all his conclusions, but his pages will be read with respect.

Unfortunately the second half of the book, in which he treats of the overthrow of the Republic and the evolution of the Empire, displays a great falling off, both in scholarship and in literary skill. Serious slips begin to make their appearance. For instance, the peculiarity of the legates allowed to Pompey under the Lex Gabinia was not that they were men of senatorial rank—legates were necessarily senators—but that they were *propraetors* (p. 211). Homo makes Pompey the head of the equestrian party in 60 B.C., and Caesar and Crassus the heads of the democratic party. What reward Crassus derived from the coalition Homo is at a loss to discover (pp. 215 ff.). Surely the equestrian party at this juncture owned Crassus as its leader; and Crassus and his supporters received a very tangible reward in the remission of the bargain which had been made some years before by the tax-farmers of Asia. Generalization, moreover, begins to get the better of narrative. Pompey and Caesar are made simply the representatives of two opposing ideas:

the idea of a Principate, and the idea of a military monarchy modelled after the monarchy of the Lagidae. The chronological order is abandoned. First the rise and failure of the one form of government is described; then we are led over the same ground again in a study of the rise and triumph of the other. Neither idea is clearly defined. On one page we are told that according to Pompey's ideal the Princeps should control only foreign policy; on the opposite page Cicero's insistence that the Princeps must be acquainted above all things with civil law is quoted without comment. We can not but think that the ordinary reader will derive a very confused notion of the Princeps concept from Homo's pages. When he reads the long lists of legal powers conferred upon Caesar, he will wonder how Caesar's "military monarchy" differed from "ce pouvoir légal, ce principat"; particularly when he is told: "la réalité brutale, c'étaient deux chefs militaires, Pompée et César . . . qui . . . n'en poursuivaient pas moins un seul et même objectif, le pouvoir personnel" (p. 224). If he has patience carefully to read between the lines, he may discover that the distinction which Homo has in mind is that between Pompey's wish to rule through the medium of the Senate and people, and Caesar's impatience of antiquated constitutional restrictions upon his freedom of action; but Homo's capacity for clear expression has here deserted him. One can not resist the unkind suspicion that this part of the book is the outcome of a hurried reading of Meyer's *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompeius* and that it was written *currente calamo*.

Certainly the last third of the book, that devoted to the institutions of the Empire, is nothing but a rapid (and wholly uncritical) summary of Mommsen's *Staatsrecht*. Here all attempt at writing history is abandoned; what we have is simply an account of imperial constitutional law. The prerogatives, titles, and honors of the emperor and the functions of the state officials are treated separately. There is no attempt made to trace the constitutional development of the Empire as a whole, or to describe the social and economic changes which influenced that development. Chronology is now thrown overboard utterly. In the course of every few pages the reader is required to jump from Augustus to Nerva, to Hadrian, to Vespasian, to Septimius Severus, to Marcus Aurelius, and then back to the starting-point to begin another series of leaps back and forth. The characters of these emperors are hinted at, but their portraits are nowhere fully drawn. In fact, a greater contrast than that between Homo's method in the beginning of his book and that which he follows at the end it would be difficult to conceive. We can not but wonder how many readers will finish the volume.

The book as a whole displays at least three capital omissions which not even its limited scale can justify. There is no account of the system of provincial government under the Republic. There is nothing on municipal life under the Empire. The evolution of the Roman organs of justice is nowhere adequately described.



The bibliography appended to the volume is fairly adequate as far as works in French, German, and Italian are concerned; but no history of the Republic by an Englishman is listed, and the only English histories of the Empire mentioned are Bury's *History of the Late [sic] Roman Empire* and Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders*. American scholarship is represented only by a few doctoral dissertations and by Marsh's *Founding of the Roman Empire*, of which Homo evidently has made little use. Curiously, while Beloch's *Die Bevölkerung der Griechisch-Römischen Welt* is included, Cavaignac's more recent and highly valuable work in French on the same subject is ignored. Surely, also, the reader ought to be informed of the existence of other and better collections of numismatic material than the old and inaccurate work of Cohen. The English translator of Homo's book will need to revise the bibliography.

DONALD MCFAYDEN.

#### BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*The Medieval City State: an Essay on Tyranny and Federation in the Later Middle Ages.* By M. V. CLARKE, M.A., Fellow and History Tutor, Somerville College, Oxford. (London: Methuen. 1926. Pp. viii, 220. 6 s.)

THIS book, which the author modestly, and justly, calls an essay, is an admirably condensed and readable account of the process of urban development in the Middle Ages in Italy, Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland. France, England, and Spain are excluded for reasons consonant with the thesis of the book. It does not pretend to be a unique or even a new contribution, yet such it is in a way. Based not on profound researches into documentary material but on intelligent and often critical perusal of what many scholars have made known in various languages, it is probably the best extant survey in English of the subject, particularly in view of the contrasts and comparisons presented. To have done so much in two hundred pages in a style that only occasionally suffers in clarity from the condensation necessary in a synthesis of this character, is no mean achievement.

The brief introductory chapter, in expounding the author's thesis, presents successfully the contrast in political tendencies in the lands where the thirteenth-century monarchies developed with those in Italy, Germany, and the Netherlands where, strong central institutions failing, "anarchy was averted only by the vigour of local institutions, characterised by a general political tendency toward democracy", an argument which logically leads to the exclusion from the treatise of France, England, Spain, and the Scandinavian countries, and, not quite so logically, to an estimate of the rural cantons of the Alps as pure democracies. The reciprocal and antagonistic forces for or against democracy on the one hand so far as internal development is concerned, and for or against political sovereignty on the other in the external relations of the towns, are concisely



set forth and weighed. The formation of social classes in the towns and the subsequent inevitable strife are clearly sketched, to be developed later, with oligarchy or tyranny as the outcome followed by experiments at federation—successful only in Switzerland, experiments which, in the author's view, as the problem of survival succeeded that of emancipation, disclose the final efforts of the towns to preserve their liberties against the absolutism and land-hunger of the great powers. Such is the thesis of the book. There is perhaps room for controversy here among the political scientists, even between them and the historians, but the possibilities thereof are ignored.

The first section of the book deals with problems of internal government. It opens with a chapter on urban economy—town-origins, the rise of commerce, of industry, in explanation of the renaissance of urban life as a countercheck to the territorialism of feudal and royal powers. This chapter, admirable on the whole, is somewhat marred by calm acceptance of exaggerated estimates of the quantity of production in the industrial towns and of town populations at the end of the thirteenth century, with no references to the authorities accepted. There follows a chapter on the patriciate, the struggle for emancipation, the formation of the oligarchies, with an extended discussion of the patriciate in Italy. This chapter is especially good as a presentation of contrasts in the various lands; the chief defect, too common in books of this character, lies in the use of Florence and Florentine terms as illustrative of Italian towns in general, since even the cautionary phrases inserted to guard the reader against generalization are not always effective. Perhaps the author would say, with some justice, that the defect lies in the reader; yet it is precisely for the general reader that the book is written. The next chapter, on the struggle against the patriciate, contains a section devoted to Florence and Siena only in Italy—a restriction to be deplored, and a section on this problem in Germany; for Flanders the reader here as elsewhere is wisely referred to the work of Pirenne, now fortunately available in English. The last chapter in the first part is one of the best in the book, on the rise of tyranny in Italy. It is a more than fairly successful attempt to carry the reader in a few pages back to Aristotle and Plato as seen through the medieval mind, then forward through the Roman and patristic writers to Marsiglio, as a prelude to a survey of the rise of the *Signoria*, wherein divergent political and economic theories are exposed if not settled, followed by an interesting and in many respects original treatment of tyranny in practice and in theory in Italy.

The second part of the essay, on the struggle for survival, much shorter than the first part, has a chapter on federation and defense in Italy, another on the same question in Germany, and a third and final chapter on the Swiss Confederation. The federal experiments in Italy are, very properly, merely sketched, and the *condottieri* are for the first time in English, so far as the reviewer knows, correctly placed. The German leagues are briefly but adequately described. In the final chapter

the author returns to a vindication of one of his initial statements, that "in the study of the medieval city state the interest must ultimately centre in Switzerland", where alone "the natural hostility between rural and urban communities was overcome by a recognition of their equally natural inter-dependence".

The brief bibliography is of no significance, and there are almost no references to authorities. The book deserves the attention of the general reading public and will be of valuable assistance to undergraduate students of medieval history. It is a piece of work well worth the doing.

EUGENE H. BYRNE.

*Les États Provinciaux de Normandie.* Par H. PRENTOUT. Two volumes. (Caen: Lanier. 1925-1926. Pp. 432, 526.)

ALTHOUGH the estates of the several provinces constitute a subject of great interest to the student of French institutions, no one has hitherto traced the full history of one of these assemblies from its origin to the close of the old régime. There are, indeed, excellent monographs on particular periods or provinces, like that of M. Antoine Thomas on the estates of the Centre under Charles VII. (1879) and the more recent studies on Béarn, Dauphiné, and Artois; but for the most part these investigations stop with the end of the fifteenth century. M. Prentout, on the other hand, has set himself the task of recounting the history of the Norman estates from their beginnings to their last meeting under Louis XIV., and has thus given us the most complete and comprehensive monograph of this type that we possess. True, he is not the first in the Norman field: M. Alfred Coville broke the ground with an excellent volume on the fourteenth century, and we owe to that admirable archivist, the late Charles de Beaurepaire, important special studies as well as his edition of the *cahiers* of 1567-1665. While freely utilizing and fully acknowledging the labors of his predecessors, M. Prentout has supplemented them by patient and prolonged research in the archives and manuscript collections of Normandy, Paris, and London, including the archives of the family of Harcourt but apparently not the papers of Dom LeNoir at Semilly. Such inquiries are rendered more difficult by the wide dispersion of the records of the estates and the disappearance of any official minutes save for the meeting of 1461. The new material is most abundant for the years 1458-1589, the central and for M. Prentout the "normal" period in the history of the Norman assembly. The solidity and good judgment of the whole work do honor to the author and to the school of Norman studies at the University of Caen. Apart from its contributions to local history, the treatise will be indispensable for all students of the comparative history of representative assemblies.

The first volume traces the chronological development of the estates, while the second gives a systematic description of their organization and workings, and a third will contain documents and indexes. On the vexed question of origins M. Prentout denies any connection with the Planta-

genet *curia*, after the long break of the thirteenth century, and any influence of the older feudal aids or military obligations. The occasion for the new institution he finds in the aid for the general defense of the kingdom levied by Philip the Fair and the resulting necessity of negotiating with the several estates, which were then consolidated by the revolt of 1314. "Thus the estates came into existence in Normandy from the necessity in which the monarchy found itself of securing the consent of the different classes of society to an extraordinary tax which went beyond the feudal contract, and this necessity was imposed by the *Charte aux Normands*" (I. 85). The history of the assembly is then followed through the vicissitudes of the Hundred Years' War, the periodic annual sessions after 1458, and its decline after Henry III. to the last meeting in 1665. Like the States General after 1614, the Norman estates were suspended, not abolished, and their re-establishment formed part of the programme of the reformers of 1788 and the *cahiers* of 1789.

For most purposes the descriptive volume is the more interesting, not only for its full account of the structure and functions of the estates but as a cross-section of the political life of a great province under the old régime. Besides their primary duty of granting a *taille*, the estates served as a mouthpiece of public opinion through their *cahiers de doléances*, which, if accepted, might furnish a basis for new legislation. In this way they had much to say concerning the economic affairs of the province, its system of law, and its university at Caen. Together with the Charter of 1315, the *Coutume*, and the *Échiquier*, the estates were an essential part of the distinctive local constitution of Normandy, a constitution which helps to support M. Prentout's assertion that France in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was a species of federal state. In the appendixes some comparison is made with other French local estates, a sketch whose elaboration must await parallel studies elsewhere. The concluding comparison with English parliamentary development is quite inadequate, especially from the pen of one who has written a substantial volume on English history; the author here makes the slip of taking too seriously the Latin text of the *De Tallagio non Concedendo* of 1297. No reference is made to the local assemblies of other countries such as Spain and Germany. The author is acquainted with Professor Carl Stephenson's article on the aids of the French towns, but does not seem to know his other studies on related topics.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

*Welsh Tribal Law and Custom in the Middle Ages.* By T. P. ELLIS, M.A., F.R. Hist. S. Two volumes. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1926. Pp. xiv, 456, 460. £4.)

MR. ELLIS's volumes constitute the most substantial contribution that has been made in many years to the study of early Welsh institutions. They continue the well-known investigations on ancient Wales by Ferdi-

nand Walter, Frederic Seebohm, and Sir Paul Vinogradoff, and at the same time take a place beside more general works on comparative law such as those of Fustel de Coulanges and Sir Henry Maine. Indeed Mr. Ellis, like Maine and the eminent Irish Celticist Whitley Stokes, got much of his practical legal training in the Indian civil service and is the author of works on the legal and tribal customs of the Punjab. In the present treatise on Wales he goes far beyond any of the earlier investigators. Walter, in *Das Alte Wales* (1859), constructed an excellent account of Welsh civilization, mainly on the basis of the laws. But much new material has since come to light, especially by the publication of so-called "extents" and "surveys", one of which—*The First Extent of Bromfield and Yale*—was edited by Mr. Ellis himself in 1924. The investigations of Seebohm and Vinogradoff, important as they were, were mainly concerned with land-tenure and tribal organization, matters which occupy only about a third of Mr. Ellis's space. In the remainder of his work Mr. Ellis treats such subjects as renders and services, marriage and divorce, trade, gaming, crimes and torts, the organization of courts and judicial procedure. In short, he has undertaken, and in full measure achieved, an exposition of the whole Welsh legal system. The result is a survey of Welsh civilization such as was hardly possible in Walter's time. In range and fullness it is comparable to the account of Ireland in P. W. Joyce's *Social History*. Of course Joyce's work draws not only on the Brehon laws but also on the general body of Irish literature, and a complete picture of Welsh life would have to include in the same way the testimony of poetry, saga, and historical narrative. But since the saga material in Welsh is much less extensive than in Irish the relative importance of the laws will always be greater on the Welsh side.

Mr. Ellis's work is not only wider in scope than that of his predecessors, but it is also independent in spirit. He not infrequently takes issue with other authorities, most notably, perhaps, in his discussion of relationship groups in Welsh society. Seebohm's doctrine, which with certain modifications has been rather generally accepted, is that the Welsh people were organized into three grades of kinship. The *cenedd*, or tribe, according to his theory, consisted of the agnatic descendants of a single ancestor for nine generations, and was a self-governing group under a *pencenedl* and other officials. The second grade contained persons related cognatically up to the seventh degree. Its organization and relation to the *cenedd* is obscure. The lowest grade, called *gwely* or "wle", consisted of males in agnatic descent from a common great-grandfather, that is, related within four degrees. This was primarily a land holding group. With the passing of each generation, Seebohm maintained, new groups of each grade came automatically into existence. This whole theory is questioned by Mr. Ellis, who follows in some particulars Professor J. E. Lloyd and the late Professor Vinogradoff. He denies that the term *cenedd* had any uniform application to relationship of the ninth degree. It was used, he argues, to denote variously tribe, clan, or sub-

clan, groups which might continue for an indefinite number of generations. Similarly, the term *gwely*, he holds, was not restricted to a group of men agnatically related within four degrees, but might be coincident with a whole clan. It tended to split up into new *gwelys* when the number became excessive or certain households changed their locality. The *gwely* was primarily "an association of people with, originally, a real common descent traced agnatically, but not confined to descent in four degrees, acting together as a joint family, and in respect to land holding it jointly as one unit or having joint interests therein". The various relationship groups of nine, seven, and four degrees had, Mr. Ellis recognizes, important significance for Welsh law. Common descent within nine degrees, reckoned agnatically, created certain rights in succession to land. Common descent within the seventh degree, reckoned cognatically, involved rights and obligations in matters of crime and tort—responsibility, for example, for a blood-fine. Common descent within four degrees, ordinarily reckoned through males, again conferred certain rights in the acquisition of land and kinship of four degrees, reckoned cognatically, was concerned with the bestowal of a woman in marriage. All these functions of the various relationship groups are fully illustrated by Mr. Ellis. But he denies that any one of the groups, as such, existed as an organized political unit.

The value of Mr. Ellis's exposition of Welsh law is increased by the comparisons he makes at every turn with the laws and customs of the Irish, the Germanic peoples, the Romans, and the remoter Indo-European stocks. His observations are often suggestive even where they are not based, as they are in Welsh, upon a first-hand mastery of the material. This appears to be the case with Irish, where, for that matter, hardly more than a beginning has been made by anybody in the elucidation of the texts. Mr. Ellis's whole discussion of comparative law would be more valuable if it were fully documented.

And this leads the reviewer to speak in conclusion of a serious defect which might serve unduly to discredit the whole work. In the matters of bibliography, references, and citations there is a most regrettable incompleteness and inaccuracy. The bibliography in the preface gives references so general as to be valueless to the *Revue Celtique*, *Y Cymmrodor*, and other periodicals; it seldom specifies editions or dates of the authorities cited; and it omits works of such importance as to suggest that the author has not taken full account of the literature of his subject. There is no mention, for example, of Eóin MacNéill's *Irish Law of Status or Franchise* (*P. R. I. A.*, XXXVI.), or of Timothy Lewis's *Glossary of Mediaeval Welsh Law*, or of J. Gwenogvryn Evans's edition of the Black Book of Chirk (unless this is disguised as the "Black Book of Llandaff", edited by "Gwynogfryn" Evans). Thurneysen's penetrating studies *Aus dem Irischen Recht* are also not noted, although the first of them, published in the *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* in 1923, appeared early enough to have come to Mr. Ellis's attention. Moreover, lack of

space, which Mr. Ellis gives as a reason for the omission of individual references, does not excuse the citation of Joseph Loth as "Lohr", or of H. d'Arbois de Jubainville as "Artois de Jubainville" (I. viii) or "Arbois de Jubainville" (I. 98). Various other inaccuracies have been noted by the reviewer, including numerous misspellings of Irish forms. Examples of the latter are *Emohain* for *Emhain* (I. 8), *Cribh Gabhlach* for *Crith Gabhlach* (I. 383), *Breta in Fuillema Gel Gell* for *Bretha in Fuillema Gell* (I. 381), and *dierbhfine* (I. 99) and *diarbhfine* (II. 141) for *deirbhfine*. It is a pity that errors like these should give an amateurish aspect to a work that contains so much valuable material. One is forced to the conclusion that Mr. Ellis is less competent in linguistics than in law, and in fact his treatment of certain matters of Welsh philology has been called in question by Mr. R. T. Jenkins and Professor W. J. Griffith in *Y Llenor*, VI. 6-25.

F. N. ROBINSON.

*The De Imperatorum et Pontificum Potestate of William of Ockham.*

Edited by C. KENNETH BRAMPTON, M.A., B.Litt. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1927. Pp. xxxviii, 108. 7 s. 6 d.)

It is a singular fact that Ockham's little treatise on the mutual rights of emperors and popes should have remained inaccessible to modern students until now. A reason for this may perhaps be found in the further fact that its contents do not add materially to what we know of the author from his earlier and more important writings. His attitude toward the burning question of the rival authorities was determined by his general philosophical position. As the unquestioned leader in the great revolt against the medieval scheme of things he inevitably approached any given problem of human society from the "nominalistic", that is to say, from the individualistic point of view. Not the institution but the individuals who composed it gave the starting point of his thought.

Especially was this true of the all-embracing institution of the Christian Church. As a good Christian, a member of the most popular, most aggressive, and most loyal religious order, he accepted without question the structure of the Church as he found it. He believed in the papal system, if not as divinely ordained from the beginning, at least as the form best suited to the needs of the Church. But—and here was the crux of the whole matter—he believed that papal authority was subject to certain limitations, and that these were to be determined, not by the papal authority itself, but by the Church as a whole acting through its authorized representatives.

This is the leading motive of the treatise before us. Ockham thinks of the emperor as the spokesman for the Christian community in its legal aspect. His status in the Christian commonwealth is as well founded and as clearly definable as that of his papal colleague. Indeed, as heir to that imperial power which was before the papal and under whose sanctions the papal power came into being, he had certain rights superior to



those which any pope might lawfully claim. When, therefore, popes undertook to discipline emperors they were going beyond the lawful limits of their authority.

The editor's task in presenting this work to the reader was perplexing beyond all comparison with its dimensions. The facsimile of the unique manuscript given as frontispiece shows at a glance the almost incredible difficulties of decipherment and interpretation. In his effort to produce an intelligible text Mr. Brampton has allowed himself a degree of liberty which sometimes produces doubtful results. For example, on page 39, line 15, there occurs a word which he prints as "universalibus", and which gives him an excuse for a three-page summary of the controversy as to "universals" (pp. 78-81). In the paragraph in question, however, there is no reference whatever to this controversy, and we venture to suggest that the word should have been *universitatibus*, which, followed by *et aliis studiis*, is in complete agreement with the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. Brampton takes the reader into his confidence with great frankness. At the foot of each page of text are textual readings with brief comments in Latin, a bit of pedantry quite out of keeping with the literary style of the introduction. The notes, covering as many pages as the text in much finer print, explain the editor's procedure at every point. It is to be regretted, for the sake of convenience in reading, that he has seen fit to omit the chapter headings of the manuscript. It would have been a still further convenience if the citations from the civil and canon law could have been printed in a different type or otherwise distinguished from the body of the text.

But, when all is said, our thanks are due to Mr. Brampton for his gallant effort to place before the learned world this altogether delightful summary of the ideas of one of the great leaders of human thought.

E. E.

*Life, Character, and Influence of Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam.*

By JOHN JOSEPH MANGAN, A.M., M.D. Two volumes. (New York: Macmillan. 1927. Pp. xviii, 404; vii, 427. \$10.00.)

WHY another Life of Erasmus? No new material of importance has been discovered, and no controversial treatment of the subject has appeared which might seem to call for reply. Dr. Mangan's answer to our question would probably be that his object in writing the two stately volumes before us was neither the display of "original" scholarship nor the maintenance of any novel thesis in regard to the elusive personality of the great humanist. He states in his preface that for many years he has been attracted to the study of the man and his work, and that he was led to the writing of his book by the desire to satisfy his own curiosity—to find, if possible, some solution of the perplexing problems which every biographer of Erasmus has encountered. To this end he began reading everything that came in his way which could throw light on his topic. He early became convinced that the conventional laudation of Erasmus's



character and services was a gross exaggeration, but it was not until he found a guide out of this laudatory literature that he began to see more clearly the path to his goal.

Dr. Mangan professes—as what historian does not?—to approach his subject in a purely impartial spirit; but one has not to read far to find that there are certain leading ideas that have determined the final impression left by the book as a whole. He writes as a physician and as a churchman. He sees, as everyone must, the curious mixture of pettiness and greatness, of weakness and power, of meanness and generosity, timidity and boldness, fussiness and iron diligence that makes up the long paradox of this scholar's life. He gives to all these phases their due weight, and this balancing of symptoms, occupying a large part of the book, forms the basis of the diagnosis which enables him to define the disease. It is all summed up in one word: Erasmus was a neurasthenic, an abnormal personality. Brought into the world outside the normal social order, he never recovered from the effects of the social ostracism incurred by his unhappy origin. Hence his irresoluteness in decision, his irascibility under criticism, his merciless indifference to the fate of men like Louis Berquin whose chief crime was that they had followed only too faithfully his own example.

With this guiding principle our author follows Erasmus through the shifting scene of his wanderings and his literary achievements. His narrative moves easily and carries the reader on from stage to stage in an agreeable, if not always convincing, sequence. A large part of the book is, naturally, made up of copious selections from the letters and treatises of Erasmus. Especial attention is given to those writings in which his dominant quality is most fully displayed. For example, thirty-five pages are devoted to the *Praise of Folly* and its effects. This, doubtless the most famous—or infamous—of the author's works, is here described as “inconsequent and silly, not to say blasphemous”, but this wholesale condemnation is modified by the admission that “the greater part of the work was delicious raillery of men and things and was written in the true satiric vein of Lucian”. What our author can not forgive is that this weapon of satire should be turned against “the monks, the Cardinals and the Popes—the irreverent, indecent, and blasphemous manner in which Erasmus at times treated things which the world has always been wont to speak of with at least respect”. His conduct in this regard places him in line with the famous satirists of the modern world, “of whom a great many were saddened, disillusioned, and disappointed men, who railed at a world which they thought had injured them or which had not appreciated them to their own satisfaction. Some were physically deformed and others mentally deranged”. In other words: Erasmus's criticism of clerical vices can be accounted for only on the ground of his mental and moral abnormality, and can not, therefore, be regarded as the rational expression of well-grounded opinion.

This psychic method of judging the importance of historic figures comes out most clearly in Dr. Mangan's treatment of Erasmus's relation to the Lutheran movement. He has demonstrated that Erasmus was a neurasthenic; he will now prove that Luther was a "psychopath". In this process he follows the method of Denifle and Grisar, neither one of whom, by the way, appears in his index. According to this method the Reformation was the result of a progressive demoralization of European society beginning with the individualistic philosophy of Ockham and culminating in the abnormal personality of Martin Luther. Dr. Mangan gathers into one comprehensive indictment of twelve counts all the scandalous tales about Luther, from the pre-natal influence of an alleged crime of his father to the silly story of the apothecary who "made an examination" of his dead body. It would hardly seem worth while to consider seriously what these two mental and moral abnormalities had to say about each other, but our author gives much space to the exchange of amenities in which they indulged. As to why Erasmus did not join the Lutheran party there was not much to be said. That has been explained by countless writers, but it is easily summed up in a phrase: he did not join because he was not a "joiner"; he never joined anything.

In those parts of his book where he has not been tempted into demonstrations of his psycho-Catholic thesis the author shows evidence of wide reading and independent judgment. In these days of psychological biography he will appeal to a considerable audience. Especially useful is a tabular view of the known editions of Erasmus's writings, impressive as an indication of the enormous influence he has exerted upon the thought of twelve generations of men. The illustrations, mostly from authentic portraits, are well done. There is a comprehensive analytical index and a satisfactory bibliography.

*History of Europe, 1492-1815.* By CHESTER PENN HIGBY, Ph.D., Professor of History in the University of North Carolina. [Under the editorship of James T. Shotwell, LL.D.] (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1927. Pp. xiv, 479, xii. \$3.25.)

THE volume in hand is a brief account of the transition from the Europe of the Middle Ages to the Europe of modern times. It might well have been subtitled "The Revolutionary Period", had not that term already been pre-empted by the historians of the great upheaval at the end of the eighteenth century. For in the author's view the three centuries in question are not a mere arbitrary segment of time, but a period with a well-defined character and a persistent trend that operates as a unifying principle and imparts continuity and consistency to events and forces which would otherwise appear unrelated and erratic. And the character of the period is essentially revolutionary. It is inaugurated by a revolution; it closes with a revolution; and from one end to the other

its dominant forces are steadily working, consciously or unconsciously, in one direction and toward one conclusion, namely, to break down the conditions and institutions of the Middle Ages and to produce the modern world.

This perception of the underlying unity of the period furnishes the criterion for the selection and organization of materials and the distribution of emphasis. The result is a story coherent, well ordered, logical, and convincing, a work skilfully planned, finely proportioned, admirably written, a thoroughly readable book, as well as an accurate and dependable text. The author's style is at once fluent and compact, never diffuse, never cramped. Particularly effective is he in his summaries, knowing how to compress without desiccating and to abbreviate without distortion. He is likewise thorough in analysis, fair and exact in his appraisal of events and persons, open-minded and impartial, moderate in his opinions.

The book comprises twenty chapters: an introductory survey of Europe at the opening of the sixteenth century; a chapter on overseas expansion; three on the Reformation and the religious wars; nine on the period from 1598 to the eve of the French Revolution; five on the Revolution and Napoleon; and a concluding chapter on Europe in 1815. The major topics are on the whole treated as fully as could be expected in a work of such limited dimensions. The most satisfactory chapters are those dealing with the Reformation, France under Richelieu and Louis XIV., the intellectual revolt in the eighteenth century, and the Revolutionary and Napoleonic era. The treatment of the latter half of the sixteenth century, however, leaves much to be desired (Elizabethan England all but loses its identity, figuring merely as a factor in the religious wars); the account of the Civil War and Commonwealth is decidedly sketchy; and the space allotted to the empire in the chapter on "The British Empire in the latter half of the Eighteenth Century" too meagre to justify the title. In view of the content it had more appropriately been entitled "The Agricultural and Industrial Revolutions".

In dealing with controversial questions the author displays discretion and sound judgment, and most of his conclusions will be generally approved. Exception may be taken at one or two points, however. Not every one will agree, for example, that the Reformation "accomplished little for religious liberty" (p. 78), or that Richelieu "left little mark on the institutions of France" (p. 150). Rightly to appraise the Reformation and its results one must look not only within but beyond: "Ohne Luther hätten wir nicht Kant und Goethe." And the judgment on Richelieu seems to be contradicted by the author's own subsequent account of the administration of the great cardinal.

From typographical and other errors the book is remarkably free. Here and there a date may differ by a year or two from the standard chronologies. Thus, the Marburg Colloquy was not in 1527, but in 1529; the *dragonnades* began in 1680, not 1684; the battle of Wandewash was fought in 1760, not 1761; and the death of William III. occurred in 1702,

not 1703. The schism between the Eastern and the Western churches in 1054 appears to have been due to controversy over rites and jurisdiction, rather than to disagreement over the Trinity (p. 21); the phrase "discovery of Russia" (p. 204) is a little misleading, when applied to Chancellor's expedition; northwesterly (p. 50) should obviously be northeasterly, and Kossova (p. 269) should be Kossovo; P. E. Prothero (p. 45) should be R. E.; and it is a question whether a geographer would place Louisbourg (p. 225) at the mouth of the St. Lawrence. But these slips are the small dust of the balance, almost too trivial to have been noticed. They can not affect the reputation of the author nor the value of his work. His book commends itself by its thorough scholarship and its literary merit, and will find a ready acceptance by teachers and students alike.

THEODORE COLLIER.

*Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London, 1669-1748, a Study in Politics and Religion in the Eighteenth Century.* By NORMAN SYKES, M.A., D.Phil., Lecturer in History, King's College, London. (London: Oxford University Press. 1926. Pp. xxiv, 450. 21 s.)

AN American historian recently published an elaborate study of a period in English history in which religious passions ran high and ecclesiastical considerations determined many points of national policy. Except for occasional reference he omitted discussion of religious matters, wishing to be quite objective. The period in which Edmund Gibson lived was one in which religious strife was violent and its study is quite as important for the historian, who would tell his whole tale, as martial exploits of Englishmen on the Continent. Even on the absurd principle that history is past politics, it does not do to wave aside the Non-Juror controversies, together with the church-in-danger excitement, or the interminable disputes in Convocation, as if they were no more important than factional squabbles of some obscure sect. They touched the very centre of English political and social life as well as the religion of the nation. In the period of the later Stuarts and early Hanoverians Gibson was a leading character in the affairs of both the Church and the State. For a long time he stood in closest touch with the Whig government and especially with Walpole and Townshend. He was a sort of confidential adviser on ecclesiastical affairs when ecclesiastical problems were very difficult. In his admirable biography of such an important person Mr. Sykes has given us a well-arranged and readable book, one with human interest. It is based upon a careful study of all the works of Bishop Gibson together with all the Gibson papers which have been preserved. As Bishop of London his papers were especially valuable to the library of the diocese. A fortunate chance brought them into its possession. Thereupon the heirs of Gibson appeared and laid claim to the papers. They were divided

among the claimants and very promptly many of them were lost or destroyed. But Mr. Sykes has made good use of what were preserved. He has also followed up the details of the pamphlet warfares in which Gibson took an active part. He has, accordingly, produced a book which is of great value for the understanding of the deeper motives of the period covered and for appreciating its spirit. As for criticism of Mr. Sykes's work, one can not help noting that it would have been better if the biographer had given more time to the study of the controversies with Atterbury and his followers. It might have cost an excursus but it would have helped the reader to judge of the merits of Gibson's work. In these controversies Gibson was not always seen in the front line of battle, but it was largely his learning that directed the replies to Atterbury. One can respect Gibson for his great *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani*, by far the most notable work on canon law by an English writer, without accepting all his points against Atterbury. As to the independence of the lower house, Gibson was, of course, right. Again, the question as to non-juring bishops in America is not so easily settled as would appear to Mr. Sykes, who does not seem to be aware of the complications of the matter. But Mr. Sykes does a real service in his careful statement of Gibson's attitude toward non-conformity and he throws light upon the position of even such a tolerant churchman as the bishop. It is quite clear from the biography that Gibson was a truly important man not merely because he was Bishop of London, and therefore ordinary of one of the most important dioceses in the world extending even to the American colonies, and was ecclesiastical adviser to the leading English statesmen, but also because he was a truly learned scholar and antiquarian as well as canonist. His works in historical fields have been superseded as they superseded earlier works, but they place him in the succession of notable English historical scholars. It was due to him that professorships in modern history and languages were first founded in the universities. A man who largely by his own efforts could make himself so important in the life of his times that he was offered the archbishopric of Canterbury and had conscience enough to decline it because he did not feel physically strong enough for the office, deserved a full biography, even if he had not played a part in English religious, social, and political history which, if not of the first importance, was, as Mr. Sykes clearly shows, only just below the highest.

JOSEPH CULLEN AYER.

*Aus den Papieren Jacob von Stählin's.* Von KARL STÄHLIN.  
(Königsberg: Ost-Europa-Verlag. 1926. Pp. xvii, 457. 28 RM.)

THIS monograph is more than a biographical sketch of Stählin; it is a very valuable study of the social and cultural development of Russia during the greater part of the eighteenth century. Stählin was born in Memmingen on May 9, 1709, and died in St. Petersburg on June 25, 1785.

Fifty years of his long life he spent in Russia, engaged in literary and artistic pursuits. He had already made a certain name for himself before leaving his native Germany. He was interested in the arts, talked and wrote about them, translated Italian operas, wrote plays and succeeded in getting them on the German stage. He attracted the attention of the president of the newly founded Russian Academy of Sciences, who offered him a position in that institution. In 1735 Stählin came to St. Petersburg, which was nothing better than a small town with an ambition to become a great city. The book contains a very good description of the place and the leading personages in it. As to the Academy, Stählin reported that it was made up of "fast lauter Schwaben und Schweizer".

From the account of his numerous duties it would seem that the position of academician was very similar to that of a professor in a small denominational college. Stählin offered courses in literature in all its forms, philosophy, including logic and ethics, fine arts, law, and numismatics; he contributed articles to newspapers; he catalogued the library and took care of the official correspondence; and in his leisure moments wrote a German grammar. As the institution grew in size and importance Stählin's duties became relatively more limited and more specific. In following his career one can see St. Petersburg grow from a backward community to an intellectual centre.

Three foreign cultures, German, French, Italian, were at this period struggling for mastery in the Russian capital. In the course of time each succeeded in making a place for itself. German became the language of the Academy of Sciences, French of the court and polite society, and, to a large extent, of the stage. Italian, as a language, did not become popular, but Italian music and architecture dominated all others. Stählin's writings show the influence of the three languages: "Alle Arten und goûts der heutigen Music." . . . "Bey den Müntzen par occasion der Zeitungen alle couranten Müntzen in Europa kennen lernen durch meine eigene Samlung und den valeur gegen Rubel und Copeken berechnet. Dabey vom Cours, Commercio, Actien, Banco, etc., etc."

Stählin was at one time tutor to Grand Duke Karl Peter Ulrich, the Peter III. of history. As the academician grew in years he was honored by various positions at court. He was recognized as an authority on art and his services as expert and artist were in demand. His papers have much to say about court life and politics but on the whole they tell us little that is not already known. The great contribution of the book is its story of Russian cultural development in the eighteenth century. If one were to criticize the scholarly author it would be for his attempt to give the Germans more credit for this cultural development than the facts, or even the material presented in the monograph, warrant.

The make-up of the book is in keeping with the subject treated. The paper is good and the illustrations beautiful.

F. A. GOLDER.



*Jean Paul Marat, a Study in Radicalism.* By LOUIS R. GOTTSCHALK, Associate Professor of History, University of Louisville. (New York: Greenberg. 1927. Pp. xv, 221. \$3.00.)

THE biographer of "The Friend of the People" has a unique problem. Most of the materials on which he has to depend are by Marat himself. But as the late Professor Catterall said, wherever there is a means of checking up, Marat is utterly unreliable. The credibility index of what is left is therefore not high. The author's decision to expand his study of the development of Marat's political theories into a biography required courage. The sources for the former are adequate; for the latter they are not. No one knows this better than the author himself. Under these circumstances it is but natural that the best parts of the work are those which deal with Marat's political writings and ideas. The evolution of Marat from a liberal monarchist to a radical of the Mountain is treated in masterly fashion. On the other hand, the statement (p. 21) that Marat in "Chains of Slavery" (1774) urged a programme of reform which the Chartists of the following century were destined to adopt, advances him farther along the road at this time than the facts warrant. Marat's claims that his work led to reform and a place bill are well known, but they are not true. Suggestions for reform appear as an addition to the French edition of 1793.

Considering the tendency in most biographical writing of to-day, Marat fares very well. To be sure the inquest with its bad odors to which all Marat's enemies had been summoned was held long ago and his champions, Bougeart, Stephens, Kropotkin, Bax, and others, had ample opportunity to give us quite a different Marat, a Marat *d'une réputation désinfectée*. The charges of his criminal record in England are dismissed as false. The creditability of his early life, occupied with science and medicine, especial optics and electricity, is established. He was a physician of recognized practice and standing, commanding substantial fees and not, as Carlyle insinuates, a horse-doctor. Neither can the September massacres in fairness be laid to his door. But alibis on these counts still leave him a jealous, morbidly suspicious character, dominated by an intense *amour de la gloire* (p. 57) and a peculiar "martyr's complex" (p. 64).

His contributions as they are revealed in this volume are not large or original. Nevertheless there is not a revolutionary leader from Babeuf to Lenin and Trotzki who does not make use of Marat. Perhaps his ardent support of the dictatorship will soon make him popular with quite another group. His work in the sciences is mediocre. In political theory he depends upon Montesquieu and Rousseau. He was among the first to suggest the revolutionary clubs and, later, the Revolutionary Tribunal—"a judicial body created for the express purpose of punishing political offenders". He won the applause of the masses by forceful, destructive invective rather than by constructive proposals. His assassination gave him the martyr's rôle which he had vainly sought in life.



The style is clear, at times brilliant, and the treatment scholarly and judicious. Possibly because the author came to the biography by the way of a study of his political theories, the human and more personal side suffers somewhat. Not till the end (p. 176) do we get a description of Marat's personality. The picture used as a frontispiece stands unidentified as to the artist or other historic merit. Real discrimination would suggest the choice of Langlois's well-known oil, representing Marat not as an orator, which he never was, but as a writer at his desk, the quill in one hand and the *bonnet rouge* in the other. Particularly to be commended is the discriminating discussion of the historical source-materials on the subject.

WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH.

*The Organization of the British Army in the American Revolution.*

By EDWARD E. CURTIS, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History, Wellesley College. [Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, XIX.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1927. Pp. xii, 223. \$2.50.)

THE title of this volume describes its contents, but the chapter-headings give us a better idea of the work. As set forth in the table of contents these five units describe the Army at the Outbreak of the Revolution, the Administrative Machinery of the Army, the Recruiting of the Army, the Provisioning of the Army, and the Problem of Transportation. The material in these chapters covers 148 pages, the remainder of the book being given over to illustrative appendixes, of 41 pages, one appendix for each chapter, a critical bibliography of 31 pages, and an index of 11 pages.

In the first chapter the author gives an account of the organization of the army, the location of the different units, together with a general description of each, and some figures to indicate the number belonging to each detachment. Following this comes a detailed description of the organization of the several detachments, with some material on the military experiences which some of the corps had had. Other topics treated in this chapter are military music, army doctors, physical condition and health of the soldiers, accoutrements, sharpshooters, regimental finance, purchase of commissions, discipline, morality, and the weather. Obviously, there could be little unity and coherence in a chapter dealing with subjects so fundamentally different, and such unity and coherence are not to be found in the general survey Professor Curtis gives.

The chapter on the administrative machinery of the army describes the organization and activities of the British War Office as constituted in 1775; those of the office of paymaster general; the civil and military branches of the office of ordnance and the work of various subordinate boards and functionaries of a minor character. From reading the chapter one gets the impression that the administrative system "was characterized by overlapping, duplication, and decentralization of authority".

The regard for detail, evidenced in the first two chapters, is carefully followed in the three other chapters of the book. From these we get an appreciation of the almost insurmountable difficulties involved in recruiting an army, and then of taking care of it in a trackless wilderness three thousand miles away. In the light of the facts presented in the volume, it is little wonder that the British army met with no greater success when campaigning on American soil.

It might seem from the title of this book that the material in it would be dull and uninteresting, but such is not the case. It abounds in incidents having human interest and will therefore have an appeal for the general reader as well as for the scholar whose chief interest is in a narrow field. But many will experience a sense of disappointment because the author so often has neglected to tell the sources of his information. In a work of this kind one expects a large number of citations, but in this book there are four pages, in the principal part of the text (pp. 29, 33, 37, and 38), where there are no references whatever, and on eight other pages (43, 45, 48, 49, 57, 60, 90, and 130) there is but one citation to a page. Another adverse criticism, and this is an important one, is that the conclusions are reached almost entirely from a study of British sources. Surely one would expect to obtain valuable and interesting information in the writings of civil and military leaders on the colonial side, and it seems a great pity that Professor Curtis neglected so many of them. Nevertheless, the study fills a real need in the historical literature of the period.

*Twentieth Century Europe.* By PRESTON WILLIAM SLOSSON, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, University of Michigan. With a supplementary chapter on modern science by EDWIN E. SLOSSON. [Under the editorship of James T. Shotwell, LL.D.] (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1927. Pp. xiv, 747. \$6.00.)

THIS volume is a commendable effort at a survey of the perplexing currents and cross currents of the history of Europe during the first quarter of the century. Following a brief chapter on the heritage of the century are four on European countries before the war, two on European interests and rivalries beyond the Continent, three on international relations in Europe itself, four on the World War, five on various phases of post-war reconstruction, one on cultural history, and a concluding chapter by the author's father, Dr. E. E. Slosson, on twentieth-century science and invention.

No attempt is made to confine the treatment "meticulously to the present century" or to the Continent of Europe. "All historical periods", says the author, "are quite arbitrary, but the 'quarter-mile post' is as good a point as any from which to take a backward glance" (p. v). One can sympathize with the difficulty of finding a good starting-point

about 1900, even if in disagreement with this cavalier relegation of the claims for periodization in history to the scrap-heap. Like certain other generalizations throughout the volume, it is misleading, even if not entirely erroneous. The statement that "in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the division between Catholics and Protestants was the chief factor in determining wars and alliances" may hold, but Richelieu's alliance with the Protestants of North Europe, and the wars between Protestant England and the equally Protestant Netherlands suggest the presence of other and more powerful factors. With the statement that "Cultural history is, after all, the real history" (p. 680) it is easier to agree, though the cynic may well ask why, this being the case, less than two per cent. of the volume is devoted to this phase of the subject. On the whole, it is one of the most suggestive chapters of the volume and might well have been expanded.

The author modestly disclaims any credit for originality save in the chapter on the Peace Conference in which his personal contact with the conference as librarian of the American Peace Commission appears. This phase of the work is very well done and, like that on science and invention, reflects the specialist. That this can not be said of the rest of the volume is but natural.

On the problems of the diplomatic background of the war there is a striking lack of appreciation of the new evidence, and the development of the two hostile alliances becoming increasingly conscious as to the objectives of their policies. Failure to see this accounts for a distribution of emphasis very much along old lines. The Björkö agreement, which was still-born, is given at length, but the really dynamic Russian policy at Constantinople and the Straits and French support of that policy after 1912 are ignored. Austria-Hungary's proposed attack on Serbia in 1913 is stressed (p. 240) but not the Russian proposals a year later. The fact that Izvolski himself suggested the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a bribe for Austrian support to open the Straits to Russian warships is omitted from the treatment of the 1908 crisis.

Semenov, von Lüttwitz, and other inconsequential individuals are mentioned, but not the Racconigi accord. "The sinister nature" of the Björkö Treaty is stressed (p. 252), but the really significant and much discussed article 231 of Versailles is dismissed with "The treaty of Versailles affirmed the guilt of Germany in causing the Great War". To speak of the treaty as a whole "as severe beyond precedent" is to forget nearly the whole of history (p. 460).

There is a suggestive bibliography of books in English with brief critical comments. *The Genesis of the World War* by H. E. Barnes is not included. Neither does Izvolski appear in either the text or in the bibliography. "Katusky" (p. 534 and index) should be Kautsky. Charles Seymour's *The Diplomatic Background of the War, 1870-1914* (1916), is still almost the best short summary in spite of the unearthing of much new evidence". The main problems of the period are clearly

stated with considerable partiality for the arrangements made after the war and for the League. The organization is logical and the style and presentation attractive.

WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH.

*Bessarabia, Russia, and Roumania on the Black Sea.* By CHARLES UPSON CLARK. (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company. 1927. Pp. xii, 333. \$3.50.)

DR. CHARLES UPSON CLARK, who has made a special study of affairs and conditions in Rumania, has written a very interesting account of Bessarabia, a country that is very little known on this side of the ocean. He has collected the material for his book not only from various works—Rumanian, Russian, and others—but writes also from personal investigation and knowledge, obtained during two extended visits to the province.

Like other regions of Southeastern or Near Eastern Europe, Bessarabia is inhabited by a mixture of nationalities, with a predominance of the Moldavian or Rumanian element. It is a country of rich rolling plains, adapted to grazing, agriculture, fruit production, and the raising of cattle and sheep. In the historical sketch, which Dr. Clark gives of Moldavia and Bessarabia, he traces the various vicissitudes through which they have passed, exposed as they were to invasions by Poles, Hungarians, Cossacks, Tartars, and Turks. In their conquests of territories lying beyond the Danube, the Turks established their dominion over Moldavia including Bessarabia, but by special treaties Moldavia enjoyed certain privileges of home rule, paying tribute to the Sultan and having its *voyvod* or ruler confirmed by him. It was in 1812 that Bessarabia, after a long war between Russia and Turkey, was ceded by the latter to the former. In Dr. Clark's opinion Turkey had no right to make the cession, for Bessarabia "was an integral part of Moldavia, and inalienable without the consent of the Prince and his council". The question is open to discussion, for while Moldavia was nominally an autonomous country, the Sultan practically appointed or dismissed its governors at his will. In Bessarabia itself the Turks held sway, as all the principal fortresses were garrisoned by Turkish troops. When in 1856 by the treaty of Paris Russia was forced to give up the three southern counties of Bessarabia, which were joined to Moldavia under the suzerainty of the Sultan, this was done not because the European powers—mainly Austria, England, and France—cared about the principle of nationality, but because Russia was thereby kept back from the Danube and its mouths.

What to the general reader is of more actual interest, namely, the present status of Bessarabia, is treated by the author quite fully and fairly. He gives a good account of conditions in Bessarabia during and after the war, of the attempts of the Bolsheviks to establish a Soviet republic, of the occupation of the country by Rumanian troops and its incorporation into Rumania, and of the repeated plots of Russian Communists to foster discontent and stir up trouble. Russia refuses to recognize the legality

of the annexation, while the Rumanians maintain that the vote for union with Rumania of 86 out of a total of 150 members of a Bessarabian diet, convened during the Rumanian military occupation, was a real expression of the will of the people. Hence, they maintain that the plebiscite demanded by Russia is unnecessary. Dr. Clark sides with the Rumanian view, although much can be said in favor of the Russian contention. However, in the bibliography at the end of the book he in his good faith cites works bearing upon both sides of the question, which may help those who wish to arrive at their own conclusion. In view of the Russo-Rumanian discord over its possession, Bessarabia may some day lead to serious complications, and Dr. Clark's book, by making the country and the questions connected with it better known to the public of America, may well be considered as a useful contribution to the political literature of Southeastern Europe.

S. PANARETOFF.

*Bismarck, Andrassy, and their Successors.* By Count JULIUS ANDRÁSSY. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1927. Pp. viii, 463. \$6.00.)

It should be said at the outset that this volume is not an addition to the source-material for the history of pre-war diplomacy. There is almost nothing of personal reminiscence in it. Closing, as it does, with a discussion of the Björkö Treaty, it does not even extend to the period when the author himself held a position of responsibility in the conduct of international affairs. This in itself would not of necessity militate against the value of the book. In fact, a statesman's reactions to the policies of other statesmen should *ipso facto* be stimulating and refreshing. But Count Andrassy's contribution is disappointing throughout, and it is difficult to imagine why he should have gone to the trouble of writing at such length. We have here little more than a survey of international politics written from the standpoint of the Central Powers and based almost exclusively upon the German documents. The account closes anomalously in 1905, apparently because at the time of writing only twenty-five volumes of *Die Grosse Politik* had appeared.

Of the three parts into which the book is divided (Bismarck and Andrassy; From Bismarck to Bülow; Weltpolitik) the first is by far the best, the second is distinctly mediocre, and the third downright poor. In discussing the work of the Iron Chancellor and of his own inimitable father, Count Andrassy writes with intense admiration and with a keen recollection of the difficulties and problems confronting Europe in the 1870's. Though he adds almost nothing by way either of facts or of interpretation, he gives a vivid characterization of the leading personalities and their policies. But already in discussing the policy of Kálnoky he becomes less convincing and shows a peculiar lack of understanding. He can not (p. 88) appreciate why, in concluding the Triple Alliance

Austria should not have demanded Italian support against a Russian attack, though it is clear from the German documents that Kálnoky feared the appearance of the Italians in Balkan affairs. He fails to see that the extensive promises of support given to Rumania in the treaty of 1883 signified very little at the time, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Turkey being all on the side of the Central Powers rather than of Russia. Even in connection with the notorious Reinsurance Treaty he exhibits a rather deplorable lack of grasp of the aims pursued by Bismarck.

In reviewing the course of events following Bismarck's overthrow, Count Andrassy concentrates more and more upon German policy, and the account narrows down gradually to a discussion of the problem of Anglo-German relations. He is convinced that the fatal blunder of the Wilhelmstrasse lay in its refusal to grasp the hand extended by England. This is the traditional view, but there is much to be said on the other side that does not appear in this book. In fact the author becomes so hopelessly involved in attempting to understand the Kaiser and Bülow, and so completely enmeshed in trying to unravel the tangled threads of the diplomacy of the years 1895 to 1905, that he leaves on the reader nothing but an impression of complete confusion.

There are not a few misstatements of fact throughout the volume. In 1878 Bismarck did not fear a possible Anglo-Austrian rapprochement, but actually encouraged it. To say that the Kaiser sent the Krüger telegram on the advice of his ministers is to tell only half the truth. In 1896 the majority of the Russian council did not oppose, but favored, the Nelidov scheme to seize the Bosphorus. These are a few of the more serious errors. In addition there are a number of inexcusable slips in matters of dates and spellings: Reichstadt Agreement 1875 (p. 24); occupation of Tunis 1887 (p. 66); Siam Crisis 1895 (p. 214); Enroth for Ernroth (pp. 112, 154); Ferguson for Fergusson (p. 202); Blanqui for Blanc (p. 242); Prussia for Russia (p. 275); Victor Immanuel II. for Victor Emmanuel III. (p. 309); Eckardtstein for Eckardstein (p. 379 and repeatedly thereafter).

WILLIAM L. LANGER.

*James Bryce (Viscount Bryce of Dechmont, O.M.).* By H. A. L.

FISHER, Warden of New College, Oxford. Two volumes. (New York: Macmillan. 1927. Pp. xi, 360; vii, 360. \$8.00.)

IN both hemispheres sincere satisfaction was felt by many as soon as it became known that Mr. Fisher had undertaken to write the life of Bryce. Having in common those great interests which are represented by Oxford, the House of Commons, history, and education, the two had not only become close friends, but the younger was given every opportunity to know and understand how varied were the activities that gave color to the career which he now describes. Mr. Fisher seemed to be the predestined biographer, nor does his accomplishment disappoint expectation.



It is manifest from the first words of the preface that the unusual complexity of Bryce's contacts with life has presented a grave problem. Fearing to be diffuse, Mr. Fisher has subordinated all else to personality. It has been his object "to present a portrait of the man rather than a full catalogue of the events and transactions with which he was concerned, and, but for the fact that this book contains a selection of letters, all that is here written might have been confined within the limits of a single not very bulky volume".

There is no portion of the present work which will not prove to be of absorbing interest to the readers of this *Review*. *The Holy Roman Empire* was much more than a book of promise. As an essay which won the Arnold Prize when its author was twenty-four, it opened up a long vista, but judging it by what it became a few years later it represents that solid attainment which justifies and fulfills promise. Let us be frank enough to remember this, however deep may be our regret that Bryce did not devote his remarkable gifts for research and writing to the task of producing an extensive *opus*—whether upon Justinian or some other subject. What he accomplished in the field of historiography is enough to beget an enduring gratitude. None the less it will be a major interest for many of Mr. Fisher's readers to discover from these pages why Bryce having won such lofty praise as a young man by *The Holy Roman Empire* did not make it his chief business to enrich historical literature with one classic after another.

In one of its most striking aspects this biography is a panegyric of the Scotch-Irish race to which Bryce belonged and of which he is one of the most illustrious representatives. He possessed to the fullest degree the physical vigor, the willingness to work, the moral purpose, the unwearying tenacity, which have been illustrated so often by the Ulster Scots. Broadly speaking he may be called a son of the manse, for, though his father was a schoolmaster, his grandfather, the Reverend James Bryce, of Wick in Caithness, and Killaig in Antrim, had been one of the most self-determined, conscientious ministers in a church whose clergy have never lacked either self-determination or conscientiousness. Incidentally this robust parson reared eleven children who were taught Greek and Latin by their mother, Catherine Annan of Auchtermuchty. Throughout the Bryce family with its widespread ramifications the atmosphere of the manse prevailed, and its young were nurtured amid surroundings where the two things most prized were piety and scholarship. Another historian who derived from similar antecedents was Macaulay, and Trevelyan in his first paragraph points out that there can be no better place of origin than a Scottish manse.

Those who are still stubborn enough to believe that *literae humaniores* furnish a splendid and solid groundwork for historical scholarship will not fail to note that Bryce was well drilled in both Greek and Latin. Family tradition required that he should attend the University of Glasgow, and thither he went at sixteen to appease an intellectual curiosity



which when he died at 83 was still unquenched—like his zest for life which Mr. Fisher calls “unsatisfied and insatiable”.

One must direct very special attention to the autobiographical fragment in which Bryce describes the three years which he spent at Glasgow as an undergraduate—not so much for its vivid delineation of the professors or for its description of college life as for the light it throws upon the discipline which Bryce survived and by which he was strengthened. Take this short passage as an illustration of what was exacted by circumstance in respect to transportation: “During the Session I had to rise at 6.30 every morning and walk three miles to college to attend a class at 8 a.m., and three miles back at 9 a.m. for a second breakfast; and in again at 11 o'clock for a class at 12, and home again in the afternoon; twelve miles to and fro. ‘Sic fortis Etruria crevit.’” Some readers whose wind was taxed by the effort to keep up with Bryce whether in the hills or on the plain will be interested to see from the foregoing statement where and how he gained his flying start. Another item from this sketch of Glasgow days is no less significant. In characterizing Lushington, Bryce says: “He also gave us English pieces to turn into Homeric hexameters. This is the only kind of classical verse composition I ever enjoyed or attained any facility in, perhaps because Homer appealed to me more than any of the ancient poets, and I could remember the verses better. A great many passages naturally clung to one's memory, but some I set myself to learn and learnt very easily. I think it was in one day that I got by heart the whole of the eighth book of the Iliad, which struck me as particularly splendid in its majestic roll.” Among memory-feats it will take a good deal to beat this, and as a tribute to Homer the incident may be placed in the same bracket with that regarding the circumstances through which Schliemann at a like age determined to excavate Troy.

The discipline in the classics upon which Bryce entered at Glasgow was continued at Oxford. Winning a scholarship at Trinity—first among twenty-seven competitors—he proceeded to gain the Gaisford Prize for Greek prose and the Gaisford Prize for Greek verse. In Greats he was “distinctly the best” of the two first classes in 1861 and was publicly complimented by the examiners—“a very signal and unusual honour”. Simultaneously he was placed in the first class in law and modern history, adding the Vinerian Scholarship in law. As a further illustration of his command of the classics it may be mentioned that when Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford he displayed great talent and facility in preparing those Latin speeches which he was called upon to deliver when presenting the recipients of honorary degrees. On the inauguration of Lord Salisbury as chancellor of the university he composed fifty of these speeches in two days. With such qualifications it was an easy matter for him to conduct conversation in Latin with Padre Tosti during the days he spent at Monte Cassino.

It seems desirable to stress the fact that Bryce possessed a wide and thorough knowledge of Greek and Latin, because this part of his training

proved to be of such high and practical value. It gave him a deep groundwork for those studies which bore fruit in *The Holy Roman Empire*, and from the classics he gained a sense of symmetry and proportion which is one of the outstanding features of that work. Latin also directed him toward Roman law, with results which were of great consequence to the study of the subject at Oxford, and of still greater consequence to the public at large through the use which he made of Roman jurisprudence throughout his studies in politics. Though he never wrote the work on Justinian which was looked for from him so long, the *Corpus Juris Civilis* was everpresent in his thoughts regarding polity, furnishing him with an invaluable standard of comparison and contrast.

The dividing line in Bryce's life may be fixed at 1880 when he entered the House of Commons as a Liberal. In 1874 at the age of 36 he had contested Wick unsuccessfully. In 1880 when standing for the Tower Hamlets he received a letter from J. R. Green, then in Rome, which contains a striking passage: "If I have sometimes pressed you to come and take the place as historian which you could take if you would, and have sometimes grumbled at politics for robbing us of the one writer who could do the work of Gibbon in a nobler and larger spirit than Gibbon's, it has not been from any underrating of the field you have chosen nor of your powers in such a field. Politics is the noblest and most useful work that a man can undertake, and in a State like England, where the destinies of nations yet to be are molded by our statesmen, it is the work whose issues have no rival in their importance."

This statement by Green is of twofold significance. It registers the regret, which has been felt by so many, that Bryce did not develop *The Holy Roman Empire* into something monumental—a work on medieval life and institutions, which would have deserved to stand on the same shelf with *The Decline and Fall*. But in the same breath it admits that action is greater than study. Doubtless Green forecast for Bryce a larger rôle in politics than he was destined to fill. In any case he would not have denied his friend the chance to see what he could achieve on the stage of public affairs. Mr. Fisher has very much in mind the same considerations which appealed to Green. In fact he begins his chapters on Bryce's election to the House of Commons with these words: "It is difficult for Americans, who have little concern for politics in their own country, to understand the imperious force which drives men of high character and wide ambition into political life in Britain. To serve one's country at Westminster, to take part in the debates in that classic assembly, . . . to enjoy the influence and the responsibility which attaches to the character of a Member of Parliament, these are attractions which, in the eyes of ambitious young Britons, outweigh the material advantages even of the most lucrative career in industry, commerce, and finance!"

The two passages just cited will suffice to explain why Bryce abandoned history and law for Parliament—or at least why he added parliamentary duties to his other numerous activities. At any rate the step once taken deflected him from any deliberate effort to emulate Gibbon.

Bryce remained a member of the House of Commons for twenty-six years, and at the close of this period was led to accept the hazardous post of Secretary for Ireland. But within ten years from the date of his election for the Tower Hamlets it became clear that his chief success was not to be won in the arena of British party politics. It may seem paradoxical that despite his splendid knowledge of history, geography, and jurisprudence, despite his ability to make a lucid and cogent statement, he did not reach the first rank at Westminster. He was respected and admired, but he never carried the House of Commons. *En revanche* he found a sphere of usefulness which proved a full equivalent. As the predestined ambassador of Great Britain to the United States he did much to redress that *injuria temporum*, manifested so often in puerile prejudice, from which both countries have suffered unduly for more than a hundred years.

Mr. Fisher leaves us in no doubt as to what he conceives to have been the most important chapter in Bryce's life, no less than its central episode. In the preface he says: "The main stress of the biography is laid, where I imagine Bryce would himself have wished it to be laid, upon his connection with the United States, whose institutions he studied and described, for whose people he conceived a warm affection, and in whose co-operation with Great Britain and her dependencies in forwarding the great tasks of humanity he reposed his brightest hopes for the future."

That Bryce was an ambassador in the highest sense and with the most complete equipment of sympathy and information is matter of common knowledge. During six years of incessant activity he disclosed to the American people that there was at least one Briton who had made himself as nearly an American as any citizen of another country could be. It is impossible here to review the incidents of this celebrated and historic mission. The main fact is that at Washington and throughout the United States Bryce preached the gospel of good-will with charm and effectiveness, and gained an influence which extended far beyond the circle of the learned. *The American Commonwealth* was a great credential, but long before Bryce returned to England he had spread the conviction that the man was greater than his book.

Mr. Fisher declares his purpose to be the delineation of a character rather than the description of a full and indefatigable career. In spite of all temptation he hews to this line so that no one can be left in doubt as to what were Bryce's salient qualities and characteristics. It is true that he was a man of few subtleties, but this fact should not be held to diminish the praise which is due Mr. Fisher for having achieved a distinct and vivid portraiture. Whatever his philosophical and metaphysical ideas—and he was little addicted to metaphysics—Bryce must be ranged among the disciples of Aristotle—"il maestro di color chi sanno". To him, as was said by William James, "all facts were born free and equal". A quenchless zeal for knowledge was the vivifying spark of his intellectual life, just as the bedrock of his moral life was a robust uprightness. With

these high endowments he traversed in perfect health a vast range of human interests, learning everywhere and teaching with brilliant success. Among the men of America he felt himself most akin to President Eliot, both using their splendid powers to serve and befriend mankind.

CHARLES W. COLBY.

*Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette, 1871-1914.* Sammlung der Diplomatischen Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes. Im Auftrage des Auswärtigen Amtes herausgegeben von JOHANNES LEPSIUS, ALBRECHT MENDELSSOHN BARTHOLDY, FRIEDRICH THIMME. Volumes XXVI.-XXXIX. (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte. 1925-1926. Pp. 871, 963, 426, 454, 593, 556, 486, 480, 887, 383, 846, 900, 361, 645.)

LAST December, at the moment when the first volume of a new series of British documents on the causes of the war was being published, the great German collection on the same subject reached its completion (except for the final index volumes). *Die Grosse Politik* is an eloquent tribute to German industry, accuracy, and persistent accomplishment. Its editors have read and sifted some 150,000 secret despatches and documents, each often many pages in length, in order to select as the most significant the 15,889 numbers which have now been printed. They fill thirty-nine volumes (fifty-three as they stand on the five-foot shelf, the fat ones being bound in two separate parts), and are grouped in three hundred chapters, with various appendixes. There are indexes of persons at the end of volumes VII., XII., XVIII., and XXV., and volume XL. will index persons in the volumes now under review. Students however will eagerly await the promised *index generalis* which will ultimately complete the whole work.

"G. P.", as it will probably be cited, is a mine from which students will get the ore from which to fashion golden monographs. It was the hope of the editors that it would be used to throw light on the dark diplomatic past. They need have had no fears that it would not be used. Already scores of German magazine articles, monographs, and big books, based on these documents, have begun to pour from the press. Even in America they have also been turned to account in a number of excellent studies: J. V. Fuller's volume in the Harvard Series on *Bismarck's Diplomacy at the Zenith*; W. E. Langer on the French Occupation of Tunis in this *Review* (October, 1925; January, 1926), and on the Franco-Russian Alliance in the *Slavonic Review* (March, June, 1925); L. B. Shippee on Germany and the Spanish-American War in this *Review* (July, 1925); R. J. Sontag on the Cowes Interview and the Kruger Telegram in the *Political Science Quarterly* (June, 1925); E. N. Johnson and J. D. Bickford on the Contemplated German Alliance at the turn of the century (*ibid.*, March, 1927); B. E. Schmitt on the Haldane Mission in

the volume presented to Professor Munro by his students; and R. J. Kerner on the Liman von Sanders Mission in the *Slavonic Review* (June, 1927). These all give a better idea of the nature and contribution of these German documents than can the present limited review.<sup>1</sup>

In arranging the documents the editors believed it preferable to group them topically in chapters and volumes which have unity of subject matter, instead of simply printing them in strictly chronological order. There is much to be said for this plan adopted by the editors, but, as critics have pointed out, it has also its disadvantages. Fortunately, in the French translation of *Die Grosse Politik*, which is now being issued under the supervision of Professor Aulard, the strict chronological order is to be followed. Scholars can therefore soon enjoy the advantages of both methods of arrangement. The French edition will also omit the German editorial foot-notes, which, as some critics have justly pointed out, often have a propagandist tendency; these foot-notes occupy a relatively larger amount of space as the volumes approach 1914; but in spite of their tendency, which any reader with a healthy historical sense will quickly perceive and allow for, they are welcomed by the present reviewer as often helpful in calling attention to explanatory or parallel material.

Volume XXVI., the first of this final series which covers the period of diplomatic conflict between Triple Alliance and Triple Entente from 1907 to 1914, deals with the Bosnian Crisis of 1908-1909. Contrary to the view commonly accepted by Entente writers, it is now clear not only that Germany did not instigate Aehrenthal's action in annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina, but that she was practically not even consulted about it beforehand. Though Aehrenthal privately informed the Powers a few days in advance of his intended action, hinted at it to Schoen on September 5, and sent Bülow a letter ten days beforehand (September 26), explaining the reasons for it, the letter was slow in reaching German officials who were widely scattered on their summer vacations, so that it actually happened that the Kaiser knew nothing of the momentous step which his ally was taking until after President Loubet had already been aware of it for a couple of days! The Kaiser was furious, not only that he had not been informed, but also at Austria's action itself. He regarded it as an unjustifiable attack on Turkey's rights, which would be disastrous to German influence at Constantinople, threaten the Bagdad Railway, and sow

<sup>1</sup> For those who are interested in other more or less critical comments on *Die Grosse Politik* the following references may be noted: *Im Dienst der Wahrheit* (Berlin, 1927), with brief articles by some forty German and other scholars and writers; "Ausländische Gelehrte über die geöffneten Deutschen Archive", a similar collection of articles in *Die Kriegsschuldfrage*, December, 1926; numerous articles in recent numbers of *Europäische Gespräche* and *Archiv für Politik und Geschichte*; M. Lhéritier's criticism, in connection with the diplomatic history of Greece, in the *Revue d'Histoire de la Guerre Mondiale*, April, 1926; M. Vermeil's summary already noticed in the *Am. Hist. Rev.* (XXXII. 655); M. Bourgeois's discussion of vol. I. in the *Revue Historique*, May-June, 1927; and the present writer's previous reviews (*ibid.*, XXVIII. 543 ff.; XXX. 136 ff.; XXXI. 130 ff., 520 ff.).

suspicion in the Entente against the Central Powers. "My personal feelings as an ally have been most seriously wounded that I was not in the least taken into his Majesty's [Francis Joseph's] confidence beforehand." "The Sultan and Turkey are treated like a herd of sheep." "The annexation will very probably become the signal for the plundering of the Turkish Empire, and cause its downfall in Europe." "If the Sultan in his necessity declares war, and hoists in Constantinople the green flag of a Holy War, I should not blame him." "It is an unheard-of folly! Vienna will be charged with duplicity—and not unjustly—and has duped us in an unheard-of fashion!" Such were some of the Kaiser's marginal comments (XXVI. 39, 53 f., 86). He was afraid that if Germany did not take a stand against the annexation, everyone would believe it had taken place with his approval. His ambassador in Constantinople, Baron Marschall, favored disavowing it, even at the risk of forfeiting the alliance with Austria (pp. 99–103). Bülow however differed from his master. Convinced that Germany must support Austria in the Balkans, lest otherwise the Triple Alliance be weakened, he believed that Germany must uphold Aehrenthal's *fait accompli*. Though Germany had a right to be indignant with Austria for not consulting her earlier, it would do no good to protest now. Anyway, Izvolski appeared to have given Russia's assent at the Buchlau meeting. The Kaiser finally yielded to his Chancellor's arguments, and Bülow informed Vienna: "In case difficulties or complications arise, our ally can count upon us" (p. 161).

Aehrenthal then induced the Turks to accept a sum of money as a solace for abandoning their nominal sovereignty over the annexed provinces (pp. 415–488); but the Serbians continued to object bitterly; and Izvolski, finding that Pan-Slav opinion condemned his Buchlau bargain of placing Orthodox Greek Bosnians under the Roman Catholic sovereignty of the Hapsburgs in return for Aehrenthal's assent to opening the Straits to Russian warships, and finding that France and England were not inclined to accept this latter arrangement, demanded that the whole matter be submitted to revision by a European conference of the powers who had signed the Treaty of Berlin in 1878. There followed a prolonged diplomatic crisis which threatened to terminate in an outbreak of hostilities on the Austro-Serbian frontier. To prevent this, Germany confidentially proffered a solution to Russia: Germany would request Austria to invite the Signatory Powers to sanction by an exchange of notes the Austro-Turkish settlement involving a modification of the Treaty of Berlin, provided Russia promised beforehand to give her sanction, when invited by Austria to do so. This proposal had a threefold advantage: it secured to Austria a recognition by the Powers of the change in the status of Bosnia; it satisfied the Entente argument that no change in a treaty is valid until formally recognized by all the Powers who signed the treaty; and finally, by omitting any mention of a conference, it avoided humiliating Izvolski by a direct rejection of the thing which he had been steadily demanding for months. Izvolski appreciated



the proposal, was inclined to accept it, but still hesitated to give a definite answer. His inclination to accept was stimulated by the fact that a Russian ministerial council of March 17, 1909, decided that Russia was totally unprepared to support Serbia by force of arms, and also by a hint from Aehrenthal that Austria might publish the documents relating to the Buchlau bargain and thus prove the untruthfulness of the assertions which Izvolski had been spreading about the origin of the Bosnian affair. Izvolski instantly begged Bülow to dissuade Aehrenthal from any such publication, and Germany accordingly did so, suggesting to Austria that it was better to keep this trump in one's hand as long as possible (p. 668). To put an end to Izvolski's hesitation, and in view of the fact that Serbia and Austria seemed to be on the point of war, the German ambassador in St. Petersburg was instructed on March 21: "Say to M. Izvolski that we learn with satisfaction that he recognizes the friendly spirit of our proposal and seems inclined to accept it . . . and that we expect an answer—yes or no; we must regard any evasive, conditional, or unclear answer as a refusal. We should then draw back and let things take their course" (p. 694). Izvolski then consulted the Tsar, and gave a definitely affirmative answer. Serbia, finding herself without support, thereupon had to demobilize her troops, accept the annexation of Bosnia by Austria as an accomplished fact, and promise to live henceforth on friendly terms with her Hapsburg neighbor. This effort of Germany's to find a peaceful solution, and to extricate Izvolski from the blind alley in which he found himself when his Buchlau bargain with Aehrenthal met with objection from Pan-Slavs at home and Entente friends abroad, has been distorted into the legend of a German "ultimatum" to Russia.

After the Bosnian crisis came the Turkish Revolution of 1909 and the Cretan question (XXVII. 1-154). In the following months, the Russian efforts of Charykov to form a Balkan League including Turkey, and of Izvolski to draw Bulgaria and Serbia closer together under Russian patronage (pp. 155-194) at first proved futile, but they were taken up again in 1911 (XXX. 201-256), and were finally crowned with success in the formation of the Balkan League in 1912 (XXXIII. 1-46). Izvolski's secret *Racconigi* bargain, promising Italy's "benevolent consideration" of Russia's interests in the Dardanelles in return for Russia's similar promise in regard to Tripoli, was to some extent offset by a further arrangement for the training of Turkish troops by Germans under von der Goltz (pp. 275-284), by the sale of four German torpedo-boats to Turkey (pp. 285-316), and by a secret Austro-Italian Balkan agreement (pp. 317-348), in which Italy with characteristic duplicity entered into engagements directly contrary to the simultaneous *Racconigi* engagements with Russia. The second part of volume XXVII. details the successful efforts by which Germany weakened to some extent the solidarity of the Triple Entente by wisely keeping out of the Persian imbroglio (pp. 719-824) and leaving Anglo-German friction there to its natural development (*cf.* Bülow, p. 735: "Il faut les laisser cuire dans leur jus"),



and especially by long negotiations with St. Petersburg which resulted in Russian concessions in regard to the Bagdad Railway according to the Potsdam Agreements of 1910-1911 (pp. 825-893). These partly offset Sir Edward Grey's unwillingness to permit Turkey to make a four per cent. increase in her customs tariff, which would have given Turkey the increased revenue necessary for facilitating the further construction of the Bagdad Railway (pp. 559-689).

The two volumes on Anglo-German naval rivalry and the failure of the Haldane Mission (XXVIII., XXXI.) are sad reading. They should serve as a warning to all advocates of great armaments. Here were two great Teutonic peoples, who for centuries had been on friendly terms with one another, now drifting into sharper and sharper antagonism. Their newspapers were mutually indulging in bitter attacks, and the seeds of suspicion were being sown which were reaped in the whirlwind of 1914. What were the causes? German commercial and colonial competition, said Tirpitz. The rapid increase of the German navy, said Metternich, the well-informed German ambassador in London. Who was right? Both to some extent. But we are inclined to agree with the opinion of the editors, which is evident from their foot-notes, that the ambassador was far nearer the truth than the admiral. As Metternich justly wrote to Bülow: "The services of Tirpitz in the development of our navy are unquestioned and great. But it is again evident that military, technical, and organizing ability are not necessarily united with correct political judgment. His judgment in regard to England is in such contradiction to the actual facts, that it almost seems as if he closed his eyes to them" (XXVIII. 19). Tirpitz's idea, hinted at in the Navy Law of 1900, was the creation of a "risk navy"—Germany need not have as large a navy as that of England (hence suggestions for a 3:4 or a 10:16 ratio, etc., in dreadnoughts), but it must be strong enough in largest ships to make England hesitate to take the "risk" of a naval conflict, and therefore be willing to make more concessions to Germany in colonial or other political matters. Germany must therefore push naval construction rapidly according to the successive building programmes which he persuaded the Reichstag to approve and authorize in 1900, 1906, 1908, and 1912. To be sure, Germany would have to pass through a "danger zone", in which England might attempt to crush in a "preventive war" the growing German navy before it had reached "risk" proportions, but Tirpitz did not think this danger was great if the Foreign Office avoided irritating England in other matters, and anyway there was no way of avoiding this "danger zone". Metternich, on the other hand, from his intimate contact with all sorts of Englishmen at dinners and week-ends in the country, regarded Tirpitz's idea as the most dangerous folly: it would simply drive England to redoubled efforts to keep up as far as possible to the "two-Power standard", and increase the already alarming bitterness between the two countries. The documents in these two volumes might therefore be summarized as a long running

duel between Tirpitz and Metternich, with the Kaiser a strong second for the admiral, and with Bülow, Kiderlen, and Bethmann weak seconds for the ambassador. Only the first and last rounds can be touched upon here, and even then only in barest outline.

In November, 1908, in view of the growing British war-scare, Lord Roberts's speeches urging universal military service, the excitement over the *Daily Telegraph* affair, and the alarm caused in England by news of Tirpitz's 1908 naval programme, Metternich was of the opinion that the tension across the North Sea might be lessened if Germany "slowed down" her announced naval construction from four to three dreadnoughts annually. Bülow favored the idea. He suggested to Tirpitz that money be spent instead on naval defense—coast fortifications, torpedo-boats, and submarines—rather than on the capital ships which were the main source of alarm in England. Tirpitz condemned the suggestion at once: as the naval programme was already published and voted by the Reichstag, a limitation of it would look like a humiliating yielding to English threats; enough had been done already in the way of coast fortifications and "small war" vessels—torpedo-boats and submarines—to safeguard Germany against a British naval attack; Germany must go ahead with the creation of her "risk navy" at all costs; and, finally, he said he would resign, if Bülow insisted. So Bülow, none too secure in his position since the *Daily Telegraph* affair, yielded and gave up the idea of taking the initiative in offering to England to cut down German dreadnought construction from four to three a year (XXVIII. 1-83).

More than three years later Lord Haldane came semi-officially to Berlin with the hope of negotiating an agreement on the basis of giving Germany colonial and political concessions in return for some restriction of German dreadnought construction as laid down in a programme which Tirpitz had completed but which had not yet been published and presented to the Reichstag. His confidential talks in Berlin with the Kaiser, Bethmann, and Tirpitz were friendly, but it began to be clear that, though both parties might without too much difficulty reach an agreement as to mutual concessions concerning the Bagdad Railway and exchanges of colonial territory, on two other questions each was eager for what the other was very reluctant to concede. England wanted a limitation on German naval construction, which Metternich and Bethmann favored but which Tirpitz and the Kaiser opposed. Germany wanted from England a neutrality agreement, which Sir Edward Grey would not accept in the form desired by Germany because he feared to tie his hands and endanger his relations with France. On his departure from Berlin Haldane was given in confidence a copy of the new German naval programme. When this was examined by the British Admiralty they criticized the large increase in personnel and equipment which it contemplated, as well as the increase in dreadnoughts which had been the naval topic chiefly discussed by Haldane at Berlin. Grey also modified some of the colonial suggestions which Haldane had made.

When Metternich transmitted these views, it seemed to Berlin that the British Cabinet was trying to shift the discussion from the original Haldane basis, and the ambassador was severely condemned by the Kaiser for having even listened to them. Metternich and Bethmann hoped to reach some agreement by continuing the negotiations; Tirpitz and the Kaiser wanted to break them off as useless, and proceed with the German building programme which had been withheld from publication while the discussions with England were still going on. On March 1, 1912, Haldane dined with Metternich in London and the two argued till midnight, Metternich pointing out how England's shift in the basis of the discussion was jeopardizing an agreement, and Haldane making explanations and tempting colonial proposals for a solid belt of African territory from sea to sea for Germany; but he also said that the English Cabinet had decided to proceed with its naval estimates, and, depending on the programme adopted by Germany, might bring in supplementary estimates and transfer some of the Mediterranean squadron to the North Sea. When the Kaiser read Metternich's report of this conversation, he lost his patience completely. He took the unusual step of telegraphing directly to his ambassador that he would not negotiate except on the original Haldane basis, and that a transfer of English ships from the Mediterranean would be regarded as a threat of war and assured a larger German building programme and possible mobilization. Bethmann thereupon very properly resigned, declaring that he could no longer be responsible for German policy if the negotiations with England were thus to be cut off. But the Kaiser talked with him, and he agreed to remain in office. Then Tirpitz threatened to resign, if his building programme was withheld from the Reichstag's consideration any longer. After some critical days Bethmann had to consent to its publication, which virtually meant the failure of any further negotiations with England on this subject. Tirpitz won out in the duel, thanks to support from the Kaiser. A few weeks later Metternich was recalled and replaced by Baron Marschall and then by Prince Lichnowsky (XXXI. 1-252).

Whether direct French influence played an important part in thwarting an Anglo-German agreement, as Izvolski says he was told by Poincaré and Paléologue (*Livre Noir*, I. 365), we can not know with certainty until the publication of the British documents on this period. The Germans suspected it, but their documents do not prove it. In view of the fundamentally divergent objectives at which Berlin and London aimed, and with two such navy enthusiasts as Tirpitz and the Kaiser on one side, and two such French sympathizers as Grey and Winston Churchill on the other, it was hardly likely that a bargain could have been reached in any case. As early as January, 1909, Metternich, foreshadowing the Haldane Mission three years later, observed, "We are gradually approaching the question whether England will guarantee us neutrality in return for a restriction of our naval construction". But he added that Grey, "who was too entangled in the net of the Entente to bring up the

subject on his own initiative", would probably merely say, "So long as you do not attack France, you have nothing to fear from us" (XXVIII. 74)—precisely the same attitude which he actually did take in the Haldane negotiations.

The failure of the Haldane Mission did not wreck Bethmann's hopes that satisfactory agreements might eventually be reached with England in regard to the Bagdad Railway and the Portuguese colonies (XXXI. 253-345; XXXVII. 1-470), but it was followed by a tightening up of the Triple Entente by the Franco-Russian naval convention, the rearrangement of the English and French fleets, and the Grey-Cambon exchange of notes (XXXI. 455-556).

The negotiations of the second Morocco crisis and Agadir, of which we have known a good deal from Caillaux's account, the French Yellow Book on the subject, and other sources, fill volume XXIX. Of special interest here are the evidences of Germany's failure to assure England of her intentions—territorial compensations from France in the Congo and not a naval base in Morocco—and the sharp Anglo-German tension following Lloyd George's Mansion House speech (pp. 195-292).

The firm hold on Morocco which France secured as a result of the Agadir crisis determined the Italians to make haste to seize for themselves a slice of Northern Africa. The Tripolitan War (XXX. 1-492), which the Kaiser suspected was due to English instigation in order to sow discord in the Triple Alliance (p. 50), did in fact have that effect, but this irritation between Germany and Italy was largely smoothed away by the early renewal of the Triple Alliance Treaty in 1912 (pp. 493-579), though the ever latent hostility between Austria and Italy persisted.

Of special interest to American readers is the volume on the Great Powers and the Far East between 1909 and 1914 (XXXII.), dealing with the consortiums for loans to China, Secretary Knox's futile effort to secure the internationalization of Manchurian railways, the Japanese annexation of Korea, the Chinese Revolution, and the question whether the powers should intervene.

More than three thousand of these German documents are devoted to the Balkan Wars and the complex and kaleidoscopic conflicts which arose out of them (XXX.-XXXVII.). They defy analysis within the limits of this review. But in general it may be said that they confirm the view that it was thanks largely to the cordial co-operation of England and Germany in the London Conference of ambassadors that the Balkan conflagration did not ignite all Europe.

The final volume, "The Drawing Near of the World War", pictures militarist Europe divided against itself through the unfortunate grouping of the great powers into Triple Alliance and Triple Entente. After recurring again to Anglo-German naval rivalry, the "naval holiday" suggestion, and the Colonel House Mission (XXXIX. 1-42), it indicates the increase of German and French armaments (pp. 143-322), and the gen-

eral tension in Europe in the spring of 1914, accentuated by Austro-Italian friction over irredentist and Balkan matters (pp. 371-410), by the fears and hopes that Rumania was shifting from the side of the Triple Alliance to that of the Triple Entente (pp. 431-530), by the Russo-German newspaper feud over armaments (pp. 531-590), and by the rumors of an Anglo-Russian naval convention (pp. 591-645).

These new German documents thus afford a wealth of material from which scholars may gain a more accurate knowledge of the complex diplomatic past and form a more sound judgment as to the relative responsibility of each country for the war. As such the present reviewer warmly welcomes them, believing confidently—*magna est veritas et praevalebit*.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

*A History of European Diplomacy, 1914-1925.* By R. B. MOWAT, M.A. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1927. Pp. vi, 343. \$6.25.)

THE difficulties of writing a history of European diplomacy during the four years and more of war and the seven of political chaos that followed, can hardly be overstated, especially when one considers how recent are the events studied and how serious the gaps in adequate authorities. Such a book was none the less badly needed, and it is the more pleasant to record the high measure of success which Mr. Mowat has achieved. His narrative, in view of the space which he has allotted himself, is necessarily an outline, but it is accurate, skilfully proportioned, and objective. He has studied thoroughly the available sources, whether official documents, periodicals, or memoirs. The story is always interesting, since it is clear, and frequently vivacious; numerous excerpts from the papers of Page, Grey, Manteyer, and House create a sense of intimacy hardly to be expected in so short a volume. In his treatment of controversial matters his statement of the issue is judicial, his conclusions phrased with commendable caution. Altogether it is a book of value, whether regarded as a general survey in which the author holds a straight course through a complexity of diplomatic cross-currents, or as a guide to more intensive study.

Mr. Mowat devotes approximately half of his book to the period of war diplomacy that ended with the Paris Peace Conference. After an introductory chapter on the Pact of London, which transformed the Entente into an alliance, he traces the efforts of each side to secure new supporters or to weld more firmly existing engagements: the winning of Turkey by the Central Powers, of Italy by the Entente Allies, promises to Russia, pressure upon Greece. The relations of the United States with the belligerents are treated in two chapters, one of which deals with the question of contraband of war, the other with the German submarine campaign and Colonel House's suggestion to Sir Edward Grey of Ameri-

can intervention. Thereafter follow chapters on the peace proposals of 1915-1916, the Russian collapse, the entrance of the United States into the war, Austrian peace offers in 1917, the organization of the South Slav and the Czechoslovak movements for independence. Five chapters are devoted to the Armistice, the Peace Conference, and the treaties of 1919. The second portion of the book, beginning with President Wilson's failure to win the approval of the Senate, is mainly concerned with the effort to settle the outstanding problems of reparations and security, although there are excursions to cover the Washington Conference, Russia and the Baltic States, the Near East and the Treaty of Lausanne. Emphasis is given to the inevitable differences between France and Great Britain as regards the treatment of Germany, which culminated in the invasion of the Ruhr. The collapse of German resistance that followed, according to Mr. Mowat, combined with the change in French public opinion and the leadership of Ramsay MacDonald to make possible the acceptance of the Dawes Plan, the MacDonald-Herriot understanding, and the various proposals for guaranties that led to Locarno.

In a book where severe compression was essential the author inevitably lays himself open to the charge of omitting or passing over too hastily issues of importance that should be included. To the reviewer it seems that he should at least have mentioned, in his chapter on secret peace proposals, the Briand-Lancken, the Smuts-Mensdorff, and the Lammasch-Herron conversations. The negotiations that brought Rumania into the war are scarcely alluded to, nor is there any mention of the Treaty of Bucharest in 1916. The student will doubtless be disappointed to find no account of the negotiations that led to interallied co-ordination, nothing on the establishment and operation of the Supreme War Council, the interallied conference and American war mission of November, 1917, the various interallied councils on finance and supplies. There is no adequate account of the negotiations between the Allies that led to the acceptance of the Fourteen Points and the pre-Armistice Agreement. It is also rather surprising that in his final chapter Mr. Mowat should have emphasized the political activities of the League without treating the multifarious interests and accomplishments of the secretariat. The inclusion of such topics is a matter of opinion; so far as facts are concerned it is remarkable that so few errors are to be found. It is not true that President Wilson asked Congress to declare war upon Germany instead of declaring the existence of a state of war (p. 95); there is no evidence to show that Colonel House agreed that the Covenant of the League should be postponed (p. 143); it is at least questionable whether Italy was not bound by the Fourteen Points (p. 146); the real reason for Wilson's refusal to receive Lord Grey was not the latter's attitude upon the Lodge reservations (p. 187).

CHARLES SEYMOUR.



*Histoire des Violations du Traité de Paix.* Par Dr. LUCIEN-GRAUX.  
Tome IV., Janvier, 1923-Décembre, 1926. (Paris: Champion.  
1927. Pp. xv, 628. 15 fr.)

THE purpose of this work is perhaps best stated in the following words of the author: ". . . l'idée directrice est celle d'un contrôle, strict et suffisant, de la mauvaise volonté allemande à s'incliner devant l'acte solennel du 28 juin 1919" (p. 495). The author's interpretation of this aim is extremely broad and his book therefore contains a great amount of material which a reader would scarcely expect to find under the title, "Violations of the Treaty of Peace". It is, in fact, a history of the execution of the Treaty of Versailles, of its modifications by later conferences and agreements among certain of the signatories, of sentiment concerning the Treaty in Germany and other countries, of relations between some of the European states, and of conditions within some of them, as Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Turkey. It includes a discussion of many broad questions, as the possibility of preserving peace, the economic problems of Europe and their solution, and future relations between European states.

All questions relating to Germany the author treats with great wealth of detail. The history of the Ruhr incident, for example, includes each step in the occupation, an account of daily changes in financial status, the condition of various classes, output of factories and mines, and many expressions of opinion by statesmen and others. Even sentiment in the other European countries and in the United States concerning the action of France receives full attention.

In other chapters he shows how Germany defaulted on reparation payments; how she failed to disarm in accordance with her pledges given at Versailles; unmasks the powerful movement, with its many machinations, for the restoration of monarchical government; shows how persistent efforts have been made to inflame the spirit of revenge, and how propaganda has been organized on a vast scale, extending to many other countries, including the United States; proves that Germany by subterfuge and deceit has enlarged her military forces; describes the friction she caused and the ambushes she has laid for France in the Saar, the Ruhr, and the Rhineland.

The Treaty of Versailles, Dr. Graux believes, has been so altered by violations, concessions, and amendments that it has ceased to exist. No sooner was it signed than Germany began to quibble about its terms and to resist their execution by ruse, trickery, lies, and defiance. Encouraged by early successes, she perseveringly pursued this course of action and has won so many considerable victories that the Entente nations have been duped and balked, and their work of treaty-making rendered largely futile and illusory. The result is that Germany has freed herself more quickly than any one would believe possible from that control by the victorious states imposed at Versailles. For this defeat of allied purposes the author holds responsible in no small degree the allied statesmen. Through



lack of foresight and weakness caused by rivalry and divergent aims, they granted one concession after another, until the treaty was emasculated and ceased to be that compact, either in letter or spirit, which imposed on conquered Germany the punishment she deserved.

Concerning the Treaties of Locarno Dr. Graux has little but suspicion and uncertainty. They are, in the first place, so sweeping a revision of the agreement at Versailles that the latter has become a "scrap of paper", has virtually ceased to exist and so can no longer be violated. The author accordingly closes his work with the fourth volume extending to October, 1925, though he had planned to prolong it into five or even more volumes.

In the second place, Dr. Graux is filled with unconquerable distrust of Germany. He believes that she will continue to quibble, evade, and deceive, and will violate the Locarno agreements as she did that of Versailles. His fear and suspicion is based in part on Germany's action since October, 1925, and also on the more general consideration that after six years of duplicity she could not so suddenly undergo a change of heart, place her cards on the table, and decide to play fair. Behind her seeming friendship, good-will, and desire for peace, he believes there are concealed mental reservations which aim at defeat of the Dawes plan, at the annexation of Austria, alteration of the Polish frontier, and a revival of the old Prussian spirit.

For students of post-war Europe this work is a vast mine of exact information, of source-material, and of suggestive interpretation. There is nothing in English which remotely approaches it in aim, scope, or mass of detailed fact. It will have high value for writers on this period who are concerned either with international relations, or with certain phases of internal development of those European states involved in the Treaty of Versailles.

E. E. SPERRY.

*International Rivalries in Manchuria: 1689-1922.* By PAUL HIBERT CLYDE, Ph.D. [Ohio State University Studies, Contributions in History and Political Science, no. 8.] (Columbus: Ohio State University Press. 1926. Pp. x, 217. \$2.00.)

To the knowledge of the reviewer Dr. Clyde's book is the first piece of painstaking research in English which has attempted to deal exclusively with the history of this subject. As such it will be read with interest by those who know that ten years ago the history of the period from 1895 even to the European War could not have been written with accuracy. The publication of private papers of Li Hung-chang, Witte, Rosen, Kuropatkin, Isvolski, Hayashi, Straight, and Roosevelt has necessitated revision of our early twentieth-century concepts of such historical dubieties as the "Cassini Convention" or Roosevelt's relations with Japan before Portsmouth. That the author has made extensive use of most of those materials mentioned is the principal reason for the historical excellence of his first six chapters.

The deficiencies which occur in chapter VII. and following seem all the more striking because of the scholarly character of the introduction. First, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the author has developed his thesis after chapter VII. to serve a preconceived purpose, a purpose contrary to that stated in his preface, and which psychologically becomes the more eccentric as apparent success attends the original effort (see pp. 116, 122, 124, 191, 154, 162, and 176). Second, these chapters while aiming to be both chronological and categorical studies fail to be either, principally because five titles, especially the Twenty-One Demands and the Washington Conference, are made occasions for digressive discourses on subjects not directly concerned with international rivalries in Manchuria.

Chapter VIII. is, perhaps, the least commendable part of the work. This arises from a novel interpretation of the Open Door doctrine against which there is the greater weight of authority of political scientists and international lawyers, among them Dr. S. K. Hornbeck, Dr. W. W. Willoughby, and Honorable Charles E. Hughes, as well as the statements of John Hay himself (*Thayer's Life and Letters of John Hay*), who, when he enunciated the doctrine in 1899 and 1900, included the two postulates declared by Mr. Hughes and sustained by the Washington Conference to be but "different aspects of the same principle". If to this premise be added what appears to be an exclusion of materials readily available and a psychological use of foot-notes and phrases (see p. 117, n. 34, and p. 164), it naturally follows that Dr. Clyde's discussion of the application of the Open Door to Manchuria does not supersede the works of several other well-known authorities, such as Dr. Hornbeck's *Contemporary Politics in the Far East*.

Failure to mention such familiar phrases as "the Nishihara loans" or "the Anfu clique" leaves much to be desired by way of continuity and comprehensiveness of narrative. The rhetorical lean-to attached to chapter X. (p. 183) is intrinsically self-contradictory and can have no place there if the aim of the author be to write history. The intimation that the United States was responsible for the Twenty-One Demands (p. 178, note) is not supported by any but one of the authorities quoted elsewhere in the same chapter and certainly not by the others.

Because Russia, not the United States or Great Britain, is the only power other than China which has furnished any real railway competition for Japan in Manchuria since 1915, it would seem that Dr. Clyde's omission of the entire subject were somewhat unfortunate. Nor is a discussion of the subject complete which does not give attention to the commercial methods and basic economic facts which have given Japan superiority in Manchurian markets. That these subjects, and more especially the triple controversy over the Chinese Eastern Railway, should have been omitted is to leave the inference that the field for research has not been pre-empted. This book will serve as an excellent introduction for more intimate field studies of a most important phase of Far Eastern

history and politics. Dr. Clyde's book is very readable, well documented, and should be read by those who would seek to understand that hydra-headed monster of Far Eastern diplomacy, the Manchurian Question.

C. WALTER YOUNG.

*A History of Japan.* By JAMES MURDOCH, M.A. Volume III., *The Tokugawa Epoch, 1652-1868.* Revised and edited by JOSEPH H. LONGFORD, D.Litt. (New York: Greenberg. 1926. Pp. xviii, 823. \$14.00.)

In the previous volume Murdoch already gave an excellent view of the first fifty years of the Tokugawa régime, when its foundations were securely laid. In the present posthumous work, the lamented author pursues with a masterly control of detail the career of that remarkable polity during the next two centuries of its existence. The result is the fullest and most competent account of the period that has appeared in any European language.

Murdoch's skilful treatment of the political history enables the reader to see the moving picture of the story precisely at its most significant spots: namely, the personalities of the successive shoguns and their councillors; the influence of court ladies upon the policies of both; the fluctuating relations with the imperial court at Kyoto on the one hand, and with the individual barons in the country on the other; the sinister activities of lordless *samurai* through these ages; and, finally, the stirring events of the last fifteen years of the period. Throughout, the changing scenes are presented in intimate terms of personal relations.

Of the economic aspects, also, Murdoch discourses with confidence and vigor: the fortunes of the peasantry, and the production of rice; the currency and the prices; the great changes wrought in the system of transportation on water; the cities, and the growth of commerce and of the guilds; and the reaction of these factors upon the material life of the feudal classes. Ignorant as he was of the important researches of Honjo, Takimoto, and Takekoshi, many of his conclusions would nevertheless delight these specialists.

Readers of Murdoch's second volume would be justified, and would hardly be disappointed, in expecting him to be as excellent as there in his discussion of the foreign relations of the Tokugawa period. Of the exodus of gold, silver, and copper through the Dutch merchants at Nagasaki; of the motives and the diplomatic methods of the American envoys Perry and Harris (on which point Murdoch corrects the extravagant expressions of gratitude voiced by some Japanese); and of the evolution of the issues, and the changes of circumstances, in the diplomatic history of the last years of the shogunate—Murdoch's analysis is based upon a study of foreign sources and native literature, and characterized by his usual penetration.

It seems to the reviewer that Murdoch's shortcomings may be discovered in the two fields, institutional and cultural. In the former, the reader will miss many a significant point relating to the feudal and general political organization of the régime, the administration of justice, the legislation by shogun and baron, and the division of the classes. It is fortunate that the gap is in part filled by the concrete facts and events along these lines which the author supplies in abundance, though without evincing insight into their institutional value. On cultural history, Murdoch's study of the Confucian, Shinto, and Dutch schools is suggestive, but hardly as original as that of Sir Ernest Satow and the late G. W. Knox; on Hakuseki and Sorai, Murdoch's views would need reconsideration. Of Katsu, Saigo, and other actors of the revolution whose heroic deeds and winged words are cited with much effect, the spiritual training which was the mainspring of their activities is not revealed. Popular literature receives little notice; in the fine arts the author is as usual uninterested.

Murdoch is a splendid popularizer, not an original contributor. His strength lies in the keen historic sense which he possessed and which seems to have grown with his years. His general weakness, aside from his failure in special fields, is due to his unfamiliarity, as his bibliography proves, with most of the enormous mass of the sources of this period. Had he used more of them, some of his acute reasonings would have been revised; for, as said Fustel de Coulanges, history is not ratiocination.

It can not be said that the late Mr. Longford has improved Murdoch's work by the notes and supplementary chapter that he has appended; the former are often unfortunate, and the latter is sadly inferior to the general quality of the volume.

K. ASAKAWA.

#### BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*The Rise of American Civilization.* By CHARLES A. BEARD and MARY E. BEARD. Two volumes. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. 824; 828. \$12.50.)

THIS is a brilliant and stimulating interpretation of American history from the earliest times to the machine age. The story is attractively presented. Almost every sentence is vivified by a deft turn of expression. Almost every paragraph is illuminated by choice quotation or incisive comment. The management of the vast body of literature dealing with American history and with numerous other phases of American life is impressive. There are minor errors of fact but they do not affect the conclusions. There may be difference of opinion as to the conclusions but this is inevitable in a large-scale interpretation of history.

Professor Beard's work is well known and his views have been widely disseminated. One expects to find in the present volume signs of all that has gone before. The subtitles of the volumes, the Agricul-

tural Era and the Industrial Era, indicate at the outset the point of view that is maintained. The story does not proceed far without the discovery of a "ruling class", and Professor Beard finds himself at an early stage in the presence of the enemy. When an ever-watchful English imperialism appears on the scene the account is well under way. It should be said however that the characteristic views of Professor Beard are made very acceptable in his treatment of his great theme. His economic interpretation of the great controversies of American history is pervasive rather than opinionated. Moderation and a sense of proportion are joined with great catholicity of mind. The attempt to establish something like a synthesis of history elicits the reader's hearty approval.

It would be unprofitable to compare the various chapters with respect to interest and importance. Readers will differ as to their merits, and the authors might be surprised at the results of such a comparison. The chapter on Provincial America deserves commendation in these days when the study of colonial history is no longer fashionable. The threads of colonial history are cleverly interwoven, and it may be doubted if the social and intellectual life of the colonies has ever been more successfully described. The chapters on the Clash of Metropolis and Colony and on Independence and Civil Conflict are excellent summaries of the best thought concerning the American Revolution. The treatment is at all times original and refreshing. These chapters are followed by Populism and Reaction. It is to be noted that Professor Beard has less to say here about the matter dealt with in his *Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* (1913) than might have been expected.

Significant chapters in the second volume are those dealing with the Irrepressible Conflict and with the Second American Revolution. In these chapters Professor Beard finds opportunity to present the results of his labor of recent years. Those who accept, without reservation, Professor Beard's approach to history will find his treatment of the great controversy satisfactory and perhaps conclusive. The chapters on the Gilded Age and on the Machine Age are instructive and entertaining. It may fairly be said that there is not a dull or useless chapter in the thirty.

The book has met with the cordial welcome that it deserves. Newspaper reviewers have been devastated by it. The publishers assure us that in purchasing it one is making a permanent investment. What are more serious students of American history to say about it?

It goes without saying that professional workers in American history will enjoy the book. They will find pleasure in sly thrusts at ruling classes, military and technical experts, lawyers, doctors of finance, diplomats, and other inescapable pests. They will readily agree with the authors that the roots of a controversy such as that of the Civil War lie "in social groupings founded on differences in climate, soil, industries, and labor systems, in divergent social forces, rather than varying degrees

of righteousness and wisdom". The point has, in fact, long been conceded.

J. P. BRETZ.

*The Golden Day: a Study in American Experience and Culture.* By LEWIS MUMFORD. (New York: Boni and Liveright. 1926. Pp. 283. \$2.50.)

AMONG the many institutions that some day ought to be established is a clinic where writers could get advice on what to read. Historians, for example, who see the changes of the past as made by leading individuals should read statistics and feel the force of anonymous people working in great masses; statisticians might well read biography as a morning exercise. A writer of intellectual history who carries a great burden of data should study the work of one who contents himself with a case of well-selected samples. He might, indeed, take as corrective reading a book like Lewis Mumford's *Golden Day*, where the writer, in large sections, carries only opinions. These opinions on the cultural experience of America turn out to be so interesting, however, that any historian who reads them will want to take his time in testing them with whatever data he may have at hand.

Starting with the dictum that "the settlement of America had its origin in the unsettlement of Europe", Mr. Mumford believes that the old-world man was dislocated by the real discovery of time—clocks brought to the Middle Ages a sense of the importance of this world—the discovery of space by exploration, and the discovery of money which broke down clerical prohibitions against usury. The dislocated man came to America, liberated but painfully ill-nourished in his imagination by his Protestantism. The more completely he had shed his background the poorer he was. He sought justification by faith in political reform, and eventually the Fathers of the Constitution supplanted the Fathers of the Church. He sought justification by works of utility, and the imaginative arts were neglected for machines.

The interest in nature was undoubtedly a phase of the romantic reaction from the bankrupt formalism of the eighteenth century. The author, being a literary critic, likes to think that immigrants came to America to enjoy the mysterious liberty of the forest, whereas most of them were anxious to enjoy three meals a day which Europe failed to supply. At any rate, the book contends that pioneering resulted in a tragic cultural loss; cutting through the wilderness was a kind of warfare and a process pleasing only to the lowest order of minds. Like all warfare it was mentally deadening and demoralizing to the warriors, and scarcely less so to the sensitive youth who stayed at home in the Eastern towns and yet thought of themselves as slackers because they were not at the great American business of chopping down trees. The frontier life, having in Mr. Mumford's estimation no quality, became tremen-

dously interested in quantity: "a thing becomes a hundred times as important if it is a hundred times as big."

America grew culturally poorer, he says, as it was dominated by the pioneer ideals. "When Mark Twain went to Europe during the Gilded Age, he was really an innocent abroad. . . . When Jefferson went to Paris from the backwoods of Virginia a hundred years earlier he was a cultivated man, walking among his peers." Perhaps; but Jefferson's contemporary, Daniel Boone, who was certainly as typical of his time, would have cut no great figure in Paris, while on the other hand, the kind of gentlemen we were sending to Europe as ministers and consuls in the middle of the nineteenth century—Irving, Motley, Lowell, Bancroft, and the like—are not reported to have seemed innocents abroad. In proving a decadence wrought by a hundred years much depends on the examples chosen. In fact the *Golden Day*, itself, which apparently began with Emerson and Thoreau and ended with Hawthorne and Melville, came when the influence of the pioneer might be supposed to have been dominant.

The long chapter on this *Golden Day* which will be important to the student of literature will be less interesting to the social historian, as he will be less sure that extraordinary men like those just mentioned, together with the mighty Whitman, are as authentic samples of American thought as are the obscure people who write letters to the newspapers. But it is first-class literary criticism. The author finds that what pioneering had begun by way of flattening American life the Civil War completed. The best way out for intelligent men thereafter seemed the Pragmatic Acquiescence, as he entitles a chapter, a resolution to like what they had; Howells, the sentimental optimist, saw beauty in America; Mark Twain, the sentimental pessimist, mocked at beauty elsewhere. But the most interesting attitudes were those of William and Henry James. The former produced a philosophy which justified American ways: whatever was efficient was right. The latter escaped from American ways and glorified whatever was old in Europe. Then came the muck-raking reformers and following them the pessimistic realists.

The *Golden Day* is not only about literature; it is literature. It is a brilliant and fascinating study of the American mind, not always the kind of thing a historian would approve, but everywhere pricking the historian into the painful task of thinking about history.

DIXON RYAN FOX.

*The Development of the Synodical Polity of the Lutheran Church in America, to 1829.* By ROBERT FORTENBAUGH. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1926. Pp. 252.)

THIS doctoral dissertation operates with what Rudolph Sohm, in a charitable frame of mind, would have called the Lutheran-orthodox, though not Lutheran, conception of church, congregation, and ministry.



The author shows certain differences in the views on polity as held by Luther and by Calvin. But they relate to external form rather than to the real difference, which he fails to note. The work is ignorant of Sohm's *Kirchenrecht* II. (1923), with its classic interpretation of Luther and the Lutheran Confessions bearing on church polity. It knows nothing of the confirmation of the views of Sohm by such eminent scholars as Otto Scheel, Heinrich Boehmer, R. Oeschey, Franz Rendtorff. It makes no use of the discussions on Lutheran polity, carried on for years in the foreign language press, particularly the Scandinavian, at home and abroad.

Our author has erected a structure without much concern for the foundation, which he has laid with the aid of antiquated secondary sources. Fully one-fourth of the book is concerned with the foundation, dealing with conditions in Lutheran churches in Europe, which were transplanted to America. In ascribing the church organization of the Lutherans in Holland to Reformed influences, he has overlooked the works of the Lutheran church historian Professor J. P. Pont of Utrecht. Pont shows in his excellent investigations, endorsed by Professor Hjalmar Holmquist of Lund, that the polity, as well as the liturgy, of the Lutheran church in Holland goes back to the Lutheran church orders in Southern Germany. They have borrowed nothing from the Reformed and are in agreement with the principles of Luther. The works in question were published in 1911 and 1915.

Our author, very faulty in judging the relation between state and church in Sweden, has entirely underrated the influence of the early Swedish church organization in Delaware and Pennsylvania. The early Swedish church in our country was not a mere copy of the church in Sweden. It considered the demands of a new country, and was in touch with the Swedish Lutheran church in London as well as with the consistory in Amsterdam. Our author also repeats B. Schmucker's untenable claim that the Lutheran church in German duchies like Cleve, Jülich, and Berg was influenced in its polity by Presbyterian or Reformed refugees from Holland, and that "their whole spiritual office was ordered after the manner of Calvin". In fact, there is nothing to show for the claim that these Lutherans in Germany or Holland, or their brethren in the first century of their stay in America, were influenced by Reformed polity.

Our author is misinformed about the history of the "Dutch" Lutheran church in our country. He follows the old, but acutely false, tradition that there were no other Lutherans in North America in the seventeenth century than the Swedes on the Delaware, and the Dutch in New Netherland; and that the first mention of Lutherans in New Netherland was in 1643, by a Jesuit missionary. If he had consulted the reviewer's *Scandinavian Immigrants in New York, 1630-1674*, he would have found the biographies of almost 200 Scandinavian Lutherans and of about 100 German Lutherans in New York before 1674. This

work shows that there were, before 1643, in New York at least 25 Norwegians, 23 Danes, 31 Germans, and 4 Swedes. In 1657, when the first Lutheran pastor was exiled from our country, there were, or had been, in New Netherland 32 Norwegians, 48 Danes, 18 Swedes, and 92 Germans. It is doubtful if there were even a dozen Dutch male members in this church at any time.

In describing the development of synodical polity, the author dwells much on H. M. Mühlenberg as the great organizing mind of Lutheranism, but he fails in showing historically to what extent, if at all, this patriarch was influenced by Reformed models. In setting forth this development, the author, as before, takes too much for granted. Instead of quoting from original articles by Sehling, Harnack, and Hauck in the *Herzog-Hauck Realencyclopädie*, he quotes from their much-abridged or paraphrased articles in the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. He has not used the former work at all, nor *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, indispensable works for anything on church history or polity. Can a scholar writing on church polity really find satisfaction in using the 1879 edition of Friedberg's *Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts* instead of one of the more recent editions?

The bibliography of this dissertation makes quite a showing on 22 pages. Much is repetition, much has but ornamental value. The author registers many German titles; but he has sparingly made use of anything that is not in English or English translation, while very much of the material he has been supposed to cover is in German, Dutch, Swedish.

A greater objection than this is the author's readiness, when direct source-material is too inconvenient, to resort to the opinions in secondary presentations. There are no references to *Evangelisches Magazin* (e.g., 1815), or to *Das Evangelische Magazin* (1830 seq.), or to *The Evangelical Lutheran Intelligencer* (1826 seq.). No fruitful study has been made of the Berkenmeyer Manuscript, or of the General Church Order of Loonenberg (Dutch manuscript, 1742). Of historical mistakes like the one attributing the authorship of the Smalkald Articles to a number of theologians, and not to Luther alone, there are a number. This dissertation has not advanced our knowledge about the development of Lutheran polity. It lacks originality and method. But, in its doctoral dress, it serves to give a new lease of life to certain errors that die hard.

JOHN O. EVJEN.

*Westchester County during the American Revolution, 1775-1783.*

By OTTO HUFELAND. (New York: privately printed. 1926. Pp. xvii, 473. \$5.00.)

THE author of this work, in an edition of 250 copies on "laid linen" paper, is an old resident of Westchester County, New York, thoroughly familiar with its topography and a close student of its history. He owns the largest collection in private hands of printed materials, as well as numerous manuscripts and transcripts, maps, prints, and other things,

respecting the county. The region covered is all that territory lying north of the Harlem River to what is now Putnam County at the north, and from the Hudson River to Long Island Sound. Now one of the fastest-growing and finest regions of the United States, it was at the beginning of the American Revolution a farming country without cities and with only one borough. The people were isolated from contact with the city of New York and either unaware of or not interested in the political problems that agitated the city.

Though the book is primarily a local history, many of the events it relates are momentous and of the utmost concern to an understanding of the war on a large scale. For during seven years and four months the county had almost no civil government, little justice, and was the scene of incessant warfare, of battles, skirmishes, ambushes, raids and plunder, atrocities, and sneaking robberies. In the language of the author, the people aligned with the American cause "fought longer and suffered more than any other community in all the thirteen colonies". Among the population there was "a substantial minority" of Loyalists. The fighting-ground shifted with frequency, yet all the while there were imminent the ravages of Cowboys and Skinners.

In two chapters there is a very good contribution concerning the series of tracts in the Westchester Farmer controversy of 1774-1775. Mr. Hufeland makes the Reverend Samuel Seabury the author of the four signed "A. W. Farmer", namely, *Free Thoughts* (1774); *The Congress Canvassed* (1774); *A View of the Controversy* (1774); and *An Alarm to the Legislature* (1775); also "The Republican Dissected" (1775), which was written, advertised, but not printed. To Isaac Wilkins as author he assigns *Short Advice to the Counties of New York* (1774). Seabury and Wilkins were neighbors, and Wilkins was a member of Seabury's church. It is reasonable to believe that they often discussed the subjects in which they had common interests, and even co-operated in their writings so far as to contribute ideas to one another. Alexander Hamilton opposed them in two tracts, *A Full Vindication of the Measures of Congress* (1774), and *The Farmer Refuted* (1775). The authorship has not been questioned by John C. Hamilton (1851) or by Lodge in his edition of Hamilton's *Works*. It is a good guess of Hufeland that Hamilton, if he wrote the second tract, had assistance from others. It is disconcerting to find that the long quotations given from these tracts by Hufeland show, upon test, numerous errors and omissions, some of which are serious. Throughout the work he has quoted long passages from his sources, as he says, to give "the atmosphere of the time". The seriousness of careless documenting is not to be passed over lightly by a reviewer.

Hufeland gives new evidence on the correct location of the skirmish of Pell's Point. One of the best pieces of descriptive writing is the battle of White Plains, in which also the localizations respecting movements and operations of both armies are given a new interpretation. He has critical observations of value on General Howe's failure to take ad-

vantage of situations within his grasp, due to faulty tactics, and this at crucial times when a right move by him might have been exceedingly disastrous to Washington's army. There is a graphic and clear account of Arnold's treason and the capture of André, in chapter XII. The author's knowledge of the region, supplemented by research, has resulted in producing three compiled maps of the region for the war, which are the first maps prepared with reasonable accuracy respecting the events. He is particularly critical of Sauthier's general map, which led many into error.

The author's composition is sometimes inelegant. Inverted sentences predominate. His punctuation is both redundant and deficient, too often interrupting the clear flow of thought. There is a fair index of 17 pages, also a printed slip of errata sent out after publication. Besides these errors there are others, only some of which are here pointed out: page 18, line 9 (and index), should be "James", not "John" Rivington; page 56, line 9 from bottom, "repressed" should be "expressed"; page 118, line 10, "Dispatch of" should be "Dispatch to"; page 235, line 1, and page 237, line 2, "neither . . . or" should read "neither . . . nor", and page 260, line 20, "nor" should read "or"; page 414, line 11, "absolute efficiency" should be "absolute inefficiency".

VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS.

*The Battle of Monmouth.* By WILLIAM S. STRYKER. Edited by WILLIAM STARR MYERS, Ph.D., Professor of Politics, Princeton University. (Princeton: University Press. 1927. Pp. 303. \$4.50.)

THE late General Stryker requires no introduction and in this, his last book, he again utilizes his research in the military events of the American Revolution, particularly those that took place in New Jersey.

As a basis for this study the author had made a special survey of the Monmouth field and from this he constructed an accurate relief map. This enabled him to solve many problems that had previously confused the student, problems caused by the fact that many writers had lacked a detailed knowledge of the terrain when interpreting the battle reports. As a matter of fact, few of the battles of the Revolution are as capable of being fully understood as Monmouth as we have the testimony given before Lee's court martial, held immediately after the battle. The author has taken full advantage of this testimony and of other important sources which he has read in the light of his special topographical knowledge.

This book follows the armies of Clinton and Washington from the time the British left Philadelphia until they reached New York. It is gratifying to find every important order, British and American, quoted in full from the orderly books; thus the reader is first made acquainted with what was the intention of the generals and this is followed by a remarkably clear and accurate account of what actually took place. The

reports of Washington and Clinton are given in full; and in the five appendixes are the returns of the Continental army, a sketch of General Charles Lee, the correspondence between Washington and Lee following the battle, and a list of the killed, wounded, and missing, American and British. There are seven illustrations but only one map which, fortunately, has contours, but does not show the various positions of troops such as are shown in the maps of Carrington, Fiske, and Greene. The numerous foot-notes are valuable and there is an index. The case of Charles Lee is handled with cold impartial justice; judged by the presented facts he is found to be simply an incompetent failure. The author appreciates the value of Steuben's tactical instruction at Valley Forge, which immediately preceded the battle, and which, to a great extent, made possible the American success. On page 77 the author remarks: "It does not appear very clear to the military student of today why Washington was accustomed so often to call his officers into council." This frequent calling of a council of war was an unfortunate necessity brought about by positive orders appearing in Washington's original instructions from Congress.<sup>1</sup>

There is some confusion as to the road-space occupied by the immense train carried across Jersey by Clinton. On page 129 it is stated that this train occupied eight miles while Clinton reported it as twelve miles (page 269). Clinton's figures are probably more nearly correct as Knyphausen informed his sovereign July 6, 1778, that it consisted of "fifteen hundred wagons" (page 82), and we should take into account, in addition to these wagons, the pack animals and the large body of fleeing Loyalists. The author (page 229), referring to Clinton's retreat after the battle, says: "His army as an entirety had not been vanquished and it is hardly to be called a brave act to abandon the field with such a force in the manner he did." From a military point of view, there is probably some room for a difference of opinion here. Clinton was under orders from London to proceed to New York (page 27). He was burdened with so large a train that his army was almost reduced to a convoy and he was forced to march on one road with the entire army of Washington on his flank. Would he have been justified to engage his entire army under these conditions and risk his train, even to perform a brave act?

This book merits a place beside the author's well-known work, *The Battles of Trenton and Princeton*.

JOHN W. WRIGHT.

<sup>1</sup> *Journals of the Continental Congress* (ed. Ford), II. 100; G. W. Greene, *Life of Greene*, I. 348; E. C. Burnett, *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*, II. 317.

*The American Secretaries of State and their Diplomacy.* Edited by SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS. Volume I.: *Historical Introduction*, by JAMES BROWN SCOTT; *Robert R. Livingston*, by MILLEDGE L. BONHAM, JR.; *John Jay*, by SAMUEL F. BEMIS. Volume II.: *Thomas Jefferson*, by SAMUEL F. BEMIS; *Edmund Randolph*, by DICE R. ANDERSON; *Timothy Pickering*, by HENRY J. FORD; *John Marshall*, by ANDREW J. MONTAGUE. Volume III.: *James Madison*, by CHARLES E. HILL; *Robert Smith*, by CHARLES C. TANSILL; *James Monroe*, by JULIUS W. PRATT. (New York: A. A. Knopf. 1927. Pp. xx, 338; x, 322; ix, 321. \$4.00 each.)

THESE are the first three volumes of a co-operative series, to include sketches of the State-Department service of all United States secretaries of state. It was planned by the late Gaillard Hunt, long a member of the department, and its historian. The admirable auspices under which Mr. Hunt's work has been continued are indicated in the title-heading. The plan is not one of making original-research contributions, although that, of course, is not excluded; but to present the results of investigation as they stand to-day. The series will be, therefore, of interest to all scholars working in the field, except for their own special periods. It is addressed, however, chiefly to the intelligent general reader, in the hope of furthering the creation of that informed public opinion on foreign affairs, so necessary at present for the United States.

This aim is pursued with a success which is obviously the result of an unusually cordial co-operation between editor and contributors. The plan is to present the work of each secretary in a relatively short and readable sketch. The eight sketches included in these three volumes average eighty-five pages each. In most cases the style is distinctly readable. It is the plan to deal but briefly with the career of each secretary before and after holding this office, which renders the presentation of personality somewhat difficult. Nevertheless several of the sketches succeed admirably in this point, particularly Mr. Bemis's *Jefferson*. The critical apparatus is relegated to the end of each volume. It consists of foot-notes and suggestions for study, brief, but well calculated to give authority to the text and to enable the general reader to follow up anything that may interest him. The appendixes, again, consist of material to which the general reader may wish to refer. Each volume is well indexed by D. M. Matteson. The series is, therefore, admirably arranged to win the respect of the scholarly world and the interest of the better public.

As to the plan itself, it is plain, as the editor states in his preface to volume I., that it does not result in a synthetic history of American diplomacy. In the earlier period, the secretary's office was often not the most important centre of diplomatic intercourse; *e.g.*, when Franklin was in Paris. In this respect, of course, the problem will be simplified as the



series progresses. Throughout our history, moreover, there have been great fluctuations in the location of the real directing power in foreign policy. Sometimes this has been the secretary himself, sometimes the President, sometimes the Cabinet, and in respect to major policies it has sometimes been public opinion of various kinds. To present these interesting variations, so important in a critique of the effectiveness of American diplomacy, through the medium of the secretaries alone, puts a serious strain upon the authors. In the more important sketches this has been well handled. A still more serious difficulty is that the periods of strain and accomplishment correspond rather to natural development and external causes, than to changes of secretaries. This is a condition inherent in the plan, and can not be met, though prefaces by the editor for each volume make some attempt at the establishment of relationships. It can really be answered only by the distinctive advantages which the plan presents. The chief of these is the concreteness which comes from sitting in the chief office in which foreign affairs are discussed and policies formulated, and seeing the different problems as they simultaneously occur and mutually affect each other. It is an added advantage that in so sitting-in at the office desk, we are associating with some of the ablest and most interesting of Americans. No other office in the United States, except the presidency, and barely that, would give so many memorable contacts, although the chief-justiceship and the ministry to Great Britain would run it close.

The first volume contains a preface by Nicholas Murray Butler, a preface by the editor, an historical introduction by James Brown Scott, and the sketches of the two Confederation secretaries, Livingston and Jay. These amply set forth the intention of the series meticulously to present facts, but to allow the authors to express in addition their opinions. They all deal to some extent with one of the great controversies of American diplomatic history, that of the relative wisdom and justification of the policy of confidence in France, expressed by Franklin and by Congress, and of distrust of France, expressed by Jay. Mr. Butler, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Bemis strongly state the Franklin point of view, to which Mr. Bonham leans though less strongly. As this conforms to the conclusions of the reviewer, he can only endorse, but it seems to him that the opinions expressed are a shade too decidedly pro-French, and that the tendency of France to seek a benevolent hegemony, as in the case of ecclesiastical relations, which are not mentioned, is minimized.

Mr. Bonham's *Livingston* admirably portrays the ability the latter displayed in a situation which gave him very little scope. It is doubtful if it will convey to the uninitiated Livingston's social and political importance, or the more extraordinary aspects of his character. Mr. Bemis analyzes Jay as he has never been analyzed before, and he presents the whole man. In striking a new balance, however, the stronger qualities have somewhat suffered, and it is doubtful if the full reason for Jay's extraordinary diplomatic independence has been set forth. The subject



matter of the volume has been more frequently and voluminously treated than that of any other period of American diplomacy. This volume deals but briefly with the French alliance, more fully with the peace negotiations, and still more at length with the rise of post-war difficulties with Great Britain and Spain. Naturally, in dealing with subjects so often handled, there is no contribution of new matter, but the foot-notes give evidence of an independent study of the sources.

Volume II. contains the sketches of Jefferson, Randolph, Pickering, and Marshall, covering the Federalist period, if indeed the first few years can properly be called Federalist. Naturally in the background loom the figures of Washington and Adams, and throughout that of Hamilton. This exclusion of the more dominant figures from the forefront renders particularly acute the special problem of the series. Only Mr. Bemis in his *Jefferson* has taken advantage of it to give a picture of the actual conflict of personalities and forces out of which policy grew. Even here, however, there are disadvantages. Jefferson's policy, which was not pursued, stands out more clearly than that which was in operation. It seems as if in some way a critique of Washington's Farewell Address should have been drawn, however awkwardly, into a series that may well give intelligent public opinion its chief basis of fact for a generation. The accomplishments of the period, moreover, were so definite, and its failures so obvious, that a useful summary might well have been contrived with little sacrifice of consistency.

Mr. Bemis's *Jefferson* is quite the best of the sketches in the three volumes. While not containing material actually new, it rehandles all the diplomacy of the period in a way that constitutes a contribution. He is particularly successful in dealing with Jefferson himself, and his realistic picture of Jefferson as a hard worker is one which has long been needed to rectify the standing New England conception of him. His analysis of Jefferson's general concept of foreign affairs, so important both before and after this period, is admirable. His detailed illustration of Jefferson's practical handling of matters, as that of the Barbary pirates, where necessity conflicted with his idealistic conceptions, should do much to enhance the latter's reputation. His recognition of Washington is full, of Adams, slight, and he seems a bit unduly severe upon Hamilton; though not more so than is necessary to redress a very fast-fixed public opinion.

Mr. Anderson's *Randolph* does not escape the pitfall of dealing chiefly with the elusive question of the latter's guilt. To this problem Mr. Anderson can hardly be said to have offered a solution. His account is favorable to Randolph, but not convincing. His statement that Fauchet's testimony in favor of Randolph "should in the absence of any other evidence to the contrary be accepted" (p. 154) scarcely indicates a sound conception of the laws of evidence. It does not seem, moreover, that the compromising statements of Fauchet need be considered so confused and incomprehensible, if one reads despatch no. 6, to which Mr. Anderson

indeed refers in the foot-notes, but which he does not use in the text. In other words the case for Randolph has been better stated. The account of Randolph's diplomatic activities is good.

Mr. Ford's *Pickering* is distinctly inadequate. It presents quite satisfactorily his prickly personality, and digests his state papers. It gives, however, no account of his attempt to change the earlier American view of neutral rights, as embodied, for instance, in the treaty with Prussia. The foot-notes, moreover, contain no reference to the *Writings* of J. Q. Adams, to the works of Hamilton and King, or to the Wolcott papers as found in Gibbs's *Memoirs*. It was, perhaps, the absence of familiarity with this material which caused him to overlook that phase of Federalist policy, with which Pickering was so closely connected, which considered the possibility of having the United States join in the coalition forming against Bonaparte. Pickering's long delay in executing the President's instructions with regard to the French mission, the chief justification for his removal, is entirely neglected.

Mr. Montague's *John Marshall* leaves nothing to be desired either from the point of view of comprehensiveness or workmanship. It makes of this short and troubled term a memorable chapter in the development of American international thought.

Volume III. contains the sketches of James Madison, Robert Smith, and James Monroe, and covers the distinctive period from the inauguration of Jefferson to the conclusion of the War of 1812.

Mr. Hill's *Madison* is naturally the longest of the series. It has two important defects in setting. It undoubtedly exaggerates the influence of Madison over Jefferson; a defect less significant as the Republican triumvirate, of these two with Gallatin, was so much a unit in action. As the volume proceeds, however, one misses Gallatin, as in that preceding one misses Hamilton. It is more serious in that Mr. Hill takes up at once Madison's specific problems, with no statement of the consequences of a change of régime and policy. The very aim of the series calls at this point for a discussion of the questions of office organization, change of personnel, and the location of foreign legations. The handling of the well-threshed problems of the period is admirably done.

Mr. Tansill's *Smith* deals with less familiar ground, and he makes a good case for the subject of his sketch, at least in answer to the graver charges of those opposed to him. As in the sketch of Randolph, this critique of charges occupies much space. In both cases a defense is made, and in both the *tu quoque* method is somewhat overindulged in. Mr. Tansill explains Mr. Smith's financial dealings, if he does not justify them; he rests his own case against Gallatin on material far from convincing.

Mr. Pratt's *Monroe* is carefully executed, and well rounded, except for the scanting of the post-war discussions and settlements. It presents satisfactorily Monroe's personality, and is perhaps the best of the many treatments of the causes of the War of 1812.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

*Jefferson and the Embargo.* By LOUIS MARTIN SEARS, Ph.D., Professor of History in Purdue University. (Durham: Duke University Press. 1927. Pp. xii, 340. \$4.00.)

PROFESSOR SEARS'S volume opens with two chapters on Jefferson's attitude toward war and his concepts of international law. Three chapters tell the story of the enactment of the embargo law, the difficulties and methods of enforcement, the collapse of Republican solidarity behind the measure, and its final repeal. Three more chapters analyze the attitude toward the embargo of New England, the Middle States, and the South. Two chapters on Great Britain and the embargo, one on France and the embargo, and a brief conclusion complete the volume, except for a bibliography and an adequate index.

The author has read widely in the manuscript sources for his period and in contemporary newspapers from all sections of the country, as well as in the more easily accessible printed sources, and has amassed a great deal of interesting material. The result is a book which performs a useful service in rounding out existing knowledge rather than in making any very novel contribution to the interpretation of the events treated. This the author acknowledges. He feels, however, that he has suggested, for the embargo, "a fairer estimate of its place in Jeffersonian philosophy and American experience than it has received", that he has shown a greater effect than was formerly recognized in the stimulation of manufactures, especially in the Middle States, and that his "inquiry into the economic effect of the embargo in Great Britain also serves to show that Jefferson was right in the major premise that the embargo would exert an extreme pressure upon British industry". The last point suggests a need for a study of the effect upon Great Britain of the non-intercourse measures that followed the embargo, down to the repeal of the Orders in Council in June, 1812. To what extent was that event really a victory for the Jeffersonian policies?

Professor Sears regards the embargo as "one of the mightiest experiments ever initiated in the laboratory of world peace" (p. 123). In fact, it is this view of the embargo, and of its author as a great pacifist, which seems to have inspired the study. The embargo is to be viewed as a forerunner of more modern peace machinery. The author would seem to be on safer ground when he speaks, as he does elsewhere, of the embargo as "a substitute for war". For, as he repeatedly says, the embargo was, in one aspect, a measure of coercion, which could be effective only through the suffering it imposed upon our European antagonists—war in another form.

Perhaps the most interesting and useful chapters in the book are the three dealing with the sectional reactions to the embargo, especially the chapter on the South. "On the hypothesis of purely economic motivation", the South should have been as hostile to the embargo as was New England; but here, "The loyalty of the South as a whole to Jefferson, and to a measure which spelled ruin to its warmest supporters, is really

touching". Professor Sears shows that the embargo produced in the South a lively expansion in household manufactures. Of manufacturing on a larger scale there was much said but little accomplished. Why the South failed so utterly to find salvation through manufactures after the fashion of the Middle States and New England, the author does not attempt to say. Was the failure due to the "peculiar institution", or were there other obstacles?

The appearance of the volume is creditable to Duke University Press. A few errors have crept in. Near the bottom of page 164 a line is repeated and one or more omitted. On page 167 appears "Shay's Rebellion".

JULIUS W. PRATT.

*Negro Labor in the United States, 1850-1925.* By CHARLES H. WESLEY, Ph.D., Professor of History in Howard University. (New York: Vanguard Press. 1927. Pp. 343. \$.50.)

THIS interesting and valuable study has been unfortunately compressed into small space to meet the requirements for its publication. It is earnestly hoped that a more comprehensive work in this field will come from this same author who is devoting himself to the development of a new aspect of negro history. Published as it is however the work stands by itself as the only scientific treatment of negro labor in the United States.

The author surveys the economic condition of the slave and free negro prior to the Civil War, and then discusses the transition from slave to free labor after emancipation. He considers the capacity of the negro for skilled labor, the relation of immigration thereto, the bearing of trade unions, and the changes effected by the World War. All important questions with respect to the efficiency and prospects of negro labor are carefully discussed to present the subject from a scientific point of view in contradistinction to the traits of opinion and propaganda which have characterized the brief biassed treatments of negro labor.

Although given as an antebellum background, the chapter on slavery and industrialism is one of the most valuable in the book. The author says that the negroes learned not only to cultivate the soil but to build the houses and to manufacture many of the products used in the South. He shows that, although mentally undeveloped, the negroes made considerable headway in the use of machinery during the last few decades of slavery. In this connection however the author should have said more about such efforts to discredit slave labor as that of the free white labor experiments like the Eli Thayer settlement at Ceredo, now in West Virginia.

Apparently for lack of space other parts of the work are rather brief. This is true especially of the treatment of the economic status of the free negro. This portion of the book could have been easily expanded

into several chapters or into a volume itself. Fortunately, this is not the case in the discussion of the negro labor during the Civil War. Here the author illuminates a neglected part of Civil War history. The numerous facts set forth give a new point of view with respect to the conduct of the army and the attitude of the administration toward the negro.

In the larger portion of the book which treats of negro labor in freedom Dr. Wesley has rendered historical scholarship a distinct service. In answering the questions as to whether or not the negro would work the author has given in general the same thought which A. A. Taylor has presented in detail about two states in his *The Negro in the Reconstruction of Virginia*, and *The Negro in South Carolina during the Reconstruction*. Dr. Wesley convinces the reader that the negro did work and did it efficiently, propaganda treatises to the contrary notwithstanding. In fact, without negro labor the South, unaccustomed to foreigners and disposed to alienate them by customary methods of controlling slaves, would have become a waste place in the wilderness, if it had not had the negro laborer whom it could handle more to its liking.

The author has rendered another important service in his account of the organization of negro labor. In this chapter new characters come to light. Most books on the negro mention those who have achieved in art, literature, religion, and politics. Herein are presented negro labor-leaders and their efforts to consolidate their group in the struggle for economic rights. Men like Isaac Myers who struggled unsuccessfully to keep politics out of their labor organizations deserve much credit for their foresight. The picture of the long-drawn-out battle and of that blind faith of the negro in politics as the solution of his problem makes this book a much needed contribution to the writing of the history of the United States.

Conceding that negroes failed to compete in skilled labor with foreigners immigrating into this country, Dr. Wesley takes up the question of the capacity of negroes to function in higher pursuits. He accounts for this by showing how prejudice and greed have continued as the obstacles to the elevation of the negro laborer. Yet the author presents data to show that nevertheless the negro has found his way into more lucrative employment requiring education and skill. This tendency has been especially evident since 1900 and still more so since 1910. The apparent inequality in skill, then, is accounted for in social repression and economic handicap.

The attitude of organized labor toward the negro could not receive adequate space in such a small volume, for this aspect itself would require volumes. What the author has written on this subject however is much more satisfactorily treated and more scientifically presented than it is in most articles and works referring thereto. The same thing may be said of the closing chapter on the negro in industry. While there is no tendency toward prophecy there is such an array of facts that the reader

can not escape the impression that negro labor is overcoming obstacles and will some day enjoy full freedom.

The value of the book is further enhanced by its useful tables and maps. Practically all of the author's assertions are supported by statistics set forth in this handy form. Equally helpful, too, are the copious foot-notes and the bibliography. These features, together with those mentioned above, make this one of the most useful books on the negro recently published.

CARTER G. WOODSON.

*A History of the People of the United States during Lincoln's Administration.* By JOHN BACH McMASTER, Emeritus Professor of American History in the University of Pennsylvania. (New York and London: D. Appleton and Company. 1927. Pp. xxii, 693. \$5.00.)

IN 1913 Professor McMaster brought to a close the monumental task which he had announced just forty years before. Now he adds another thick volume which, though not designated as an integral part of the earlier series, might well have been labelled volume IX. He picks up the narrative where he had left off, with the establishment of the Confederate government and the inauguration of Lincoln, and carries it through the war to the reorganization of the Southern states under the plan of Andrew Johnson in the summer of 1865. He thus makes connection with the work of his colleague Oberholtzer.

It could hardly be expected that within the limits of a single volume of a general nature much new information could be offered on a field that has been the subject of so much investigation as has the Civil War. In truth the book adds very little to our knowledge of the facts about the war and practically nothing in the way of new interpretations; but there is an attempt at a different emphasis and the volume must justify itself on that score. The military campaigns are compressed into very brief space and, except for the one chapter given to the presidential election of 1864, little attention is paid to political contests. In keeping with the title, much more consideration is given to business conditions and to the various phases of popular opinion on the conduct of the war, in both North and South, to the extent that that opinion was articulate in the newspapers. There are excellent accounts, for instance, of the confusion wrought by the deranged currency in the North in 1862, of the opposition to the state drafts for the army in the same year, and of the resistance to the federal draft in 1863. Considerable attention, not always discriminating or even objective, is given to the activities, real and alleged, of the "Sons of Liberty" in the Western states. Almost exactly one-fourth of the text—162 pages by actual count—is given to the general subject of foreign relations, especially the efforts of the Confederates to obtain foreign recognition, European supplies, and a navy, and the con-



troversies over the building of the Confederate cruisers, their raids on United States commerce, and blockade-running.

The volume exhibits the methods and style to which Professor McMaster has habituated himself for more than a generation. The narrative is dignified, massive, compact, rather heavy, but not always slow, and, unfortunately, not always clear. Probably his habit of paraphrasing his source is responsible for this occasional lapse into obscurity, for the reader is puzzled at times to know whether he has passed from a paraphrase into the general narrative again, and whether an expression of opinion is really in the source itself or is the judgment of the historian. McMaster seldom obtrudes his own opinion, however, but seems to prefer to show how the people and their leaders reacted to the varied developments of the war. Here and there is a bit of vivid description, as in the picture of the incompetency and pitiable confusion in the attempt to provide hospital relief for the wounded after the second Bull Run, and in that of the bewildered terror which spread over Pennsylvania as Lee threatened Harrisburg and Philadelphia while he marched toward Gettysburg. It is surprising to find that while sixteen pages are devoted to this invasion of Pennsylvania only a scant two pages are allotted to the more important Vicksburg campaigns. Doubtless the former bulked larger in the contemporary Northern mind and therefore in Professor McMaster's favorite sources. One notes a few infelicitous sentences, as: "A plank, understood to call for changes in the cabinet" (p. 506), which though clear enough in meaning jars on the ear. Another instance is in the use of "her" (p. 171, l. 23) without discoverable antecedent of either sex.

Professor McMaster has made no wide excursion through the sources of the period. He makes frequent use of the *War of the Rebellion Records*, state papers, and diplomatic records, but relies chiefly upon the newspapers as has long been his custom. He rarely makes reference to any of the host of monographs that are now available and one is often led to suspect that he has not read them. He began his work in the days when there were few monographs of value to consult, and whether from choice or habit he has never made much use of them. When compared with the abundant citations in Channing's last volume his foot-notes seem singularly barren. There may be a certain admirable quality of independence in this attitude; but the monographs would have saved him from a number of slips. To cite a single instance, an examination of J. C. McGregor's *Disruption of Virginia* would have shown that a very considerable number of counties in western Virginia did not desire separation from the parent state in 1861.

A few misstatements catch the eye, none of which is seriously damaging. McClellan's father-in-law, R. B. Marcy, was a captain and not a major in 1851 (pp. 75-76). It is more accurate to say that Lee divided his army into three "corps" rather than "divisions" after Chancellorsville (p. 381). It is certainly incorrect to include Lee's army among



those of the Confederacy which suffered from low morale after Vicksburg and Gettysburg (p. 423). The number of nays cast in the House of Representatives against the joint resolution proposing the Thirteenth Amendment is given on the same page (p. 508) as both sixty-four and sixty-five. The latter is the correct number. Several misspellings occur which should be corrected in later editions. "Yielded" is clearly wielded (p. 6, l. 17); "Williards Hotel" is obviously Willard's Hotel (p. 45); "Peirpont" should be Pierpont (p. 54); "Contraras" is Contreras (p. 75); "Pickwick Papers" should be Pickett Papers (p. 374); "McCause-land" is McCausland (p. 433); and "Commissary of Substance" is properly Commissary of Subsistence (p. 464, note). The index is full and seems to be well done.

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL.

*The Borderland in the Civil War.* By EDWARD CONRAD SMITH, Assistant Professor of Political Science, New York University. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. 412. \$3.50.)

"THE Borderland", according to Professor Smith, included "the southern halves of Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, all of Trans-Alleghany Virginia, and all but insignificant parts of Kentucky and Missouri." Its white population was nearly as great as that of the eleven seceding states. Since geography and the social and economic structure of its population had made it a distinct and a homogeneous section, "whatever decision it made, it would be united". Therefore, the author thinks, "the attitude of this section afforded easily the most important problem of the war". Accordingly he does not confine himself to events of the war period, as the book's title would suggest. There is a chapter on Social and Economic Conditions. Then come two on the Election of 1860 and the Defeat of the Proposed Compromises, which show this section in the rôle of mediator. It assumed this rôle because of its people's devotion to the Union—an attitude, it is refreshing to find, that was based on practical considerations and had no relation to sentiment and Webster. A chapter on the Early Secessionist Movement on the Border and another on Lincoln and the Border States take us through the Fort Sumter affair. Up to this time the Border's position was "practically one of neutrality". For while it blamed the South for precipitating the war and felt that Lincoln's policies were Unionist measures, its people were Southern in origin, it believed that its economic interests were still tied up with the South, it blamed the Abolitionists for provoking the South to secession, and it was unwilling to fight for the freedom of slaves, which, indeed, it did not desire. From this position it was soon won, and held, to ardent support of the Federal side through Lincoln's diplomacy, under which local opinion and local leaders were allowed full freedom on all "secondary issues". The details of this transition in the non-slaveholding border appear under "The Response of the North";

those in West Virginia, Missouri, and Kentucky receive a chapter each. Chapters on the Copperhead Movement and Problems of the Border Slave States reinforce the leading idea. The value of books like this lies primarily in the convenient summarizing of important intra-state events which are not apt to find their proper place in the larger story while the studies of them lie scattered here and there. Judicious selection and pertinent first-hand investigation combine to make this summary particularly good. The weight of the facts it presents, moreover, should cause a revaluation of vital factors in the Civil War: along with geography, blockade, transportation, and industry, military strategy, the spirit of the age, and what not, we must now consider again the weight of superiority in numbers and the statesmanship by which it was lost as well as that by which it was won. Few, probably, will agree that if this section had "remained neutral . . . the division of the United States into two republics was certain"; and fewer still that "the decision of Kentucky was the determining factor in the war". But something must be conceded to the specialist. A more serious fault is the injection of rather cocksure opinions on extraneous matters. And it is perfectly maddening to have to look through foot-notes for 225 pages (to take a random illustration) in order to discover what work of "Violette" is cited on page 260. But these are small matters. The book is one that many should read and every student of American history should have at hand.

C. C. PEARSON.

*An Aide-de-Camp of Lee, being the Papers of Colonel Charles Marshall, sometime Aide-de-Camp, Military Secretary, and Assistant Adjutant General on the Staff of Robert E. Lee, 1862-1865.* Edited by Major-General Sir FREDERICK MAURICE. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1927. Pp. xxx, 287. \$4.00.)

COLONEL MARSHALL served as military secretary to General Lee from March, 1862, to the surrender. His duties brought him into close association with his chief and gave him access to a mine of valuable information concerning Lee's military policy and the operations of the Army of Northern Virginia. His papers are based upon the information thus acquired. It is fortunate that they should now be given to the public with the comments of so talented a soldier and military historian as Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice.

Of especial interest is the evidence at first hand of incidents long the subject of controversy: Jackson's tardiness in the Seven Days; Lee's conception of the flank movement at Chancellorsville; Stuart's responsibility for the failure of the Gettysburg campaign.

It was Lee's policy to avoid great battles whenever possible and to protect Richmond by threatening Washington. "The defense of Richmond controlled all other considerations", for "Richmond had a value

from a military point of view that far exceeded its political importance." What Lee feared above all else was an advance by the James River, for then all the advantages would be with the enemy, who could transport his troops by water in perfect safety to within a day's march of the city.

It was to relieve Richmond that Lee moved against Pope. And only the delay of his cavalry prevented him from crushing Pope at the outset. But as Maurice points out, the battle at Manassas was no part of his plan.

Lee invaded Maryland because he could not remain where he was. The country around had been stripped and the army had either to go forward where supplies could be secured and the enemy kept north of the Potomac or to retire, with the risk, ever in Lee's mind, and increased when McClellan returned to command, that the enemy would again send such forces by water against Richmond "as must have taken General Lee back immediately to the place from which he had set out on his Northern campaign". To stand and accept attacks from a foe so greatly superior in numbers and resources meant ultimate destruction. To advance relieved northern Virginia, increased the difficulties of the enemy, and offered possibilities of even greater results. In Maurice's opinion, Lee should have recrossed the Potomac immediately after capturing Harper's Ferry and so have avoided Antietam.

The same influences which caused Lee to invade Maryland led him into Pennsylvania with the added consideration that a victory at that time in Northern territory would save Vicksburg. The campaign failed through no fault of Lee's plans. Marshall holds Stuart responsible, and Maurice agrees. That Stuart was conscious of error is manifest from his remarks to Marshall.

As to Gettysburg itself, "the imperfect, halting way in which his (Lee's) corps commanders, especially Ewell, fought the battle, gave victory . . . finally to the foe". But Maurice does not absolve Lee and his staff from blame. He considers that Lee failed through "the lack of clear written orders".

Lee's difficulties in securing the proper co-operation of his subordinates were those of all commanding officers in the Civil War and were due largely to the absence of a professionally trained staff.

The last paper tells of the surrender at Appomattox. Colonel Marshall was the only Confederate officer present with General Lee, and his story, as an eye-witness, is very interesting.

We agree with General Maurice as to the great value and importance of these papers. His own comments are instructive and the reader will enjoy his introduction, which is in the nature of an essay on General Lee in the field.

*The Peacemakers of 1864.* By EDWARD CHASE KIRKLAND. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. 279. \$2.50.)

IN this volume the author tells the story of the various efforts in 1864 to end the Civil War with a peace without victory. After analyzing the

various factors and factions involved in these peace movements, he takes up Greeley's mission to the Confederate commissioners at Niagara with Lincoln's letter, "To Whom It May Concern", in his pocket; the absurd Gilmore-Jaquess peace jaunt to Richmond; the fruitless efforts of Jeremiah S. Black to bring about negotiations through his former colleagues in the Buchanan Cabinet, Stanton and Thompson; the machinations of Vallandigham to force peace through Lincoln's defeat at the polls; the Blair mission to the Confederate capital; and the Hampton Roads Conference, which finally "put an end to the talk of peace by negotiations and determined that peace should come only by military victory".

As its title suggests, the book deals not so much with the peace movements as such as with the individuals engaged in them. Some of these men on both sides were actuated by high motives, either to make peace or to strengthen the public morale, but as one follows the personal and political intrigues here so cleverly unravelled one can not escape the conviction that many of those most active and vocal in peace efforts were much more concerned to make trouble for their respective governments than to bring peace to their suffering countrymen. Indeed, the book might very appropriately have been called "The Mischief-makers of 1864".

It is, indeed, a motley crew of mischief-makers whose antics the author parades before us. Among the minor members of the crew, in the North, were Fernando Wood, "prince of rascals", Clement Vallandigham, most "belligerent" of peacemakers, William C. Jewett, "an imbecile optimist", James R. Gilmore, "an uninteresting representative of the self-made business man", and Colonel James Jaquess, a nineteenth-century Covenanter. There, too, was the dyspeptic Greeley whose attitude toward the issues of peace and war varied according to the condition of his liver; and last, but by no means least, there was the Blair clan—F. P., sr., Montgomery, and F. P., jr.—"great politicians" without a party who hoped to find in the peace movement an "opportunity to strike one last blow to recover the prestige which had thus dwindled away".

On the Confederate side, omitting numerous unimportant individuals, were Jacob Thompson, in "Northern eyes one of the most detestable traitors in all Secessia"; Clement C. Clay, jr., "an inconspicuous politician" of Alabama; John A. Campbell, who had accepted a minor position under the Confederate government not that he might advance its cause but that he might "be in a more influential position for promoting peace"; Robert Mercer Taliaferro Hunter, whose qualifications as a peacemaker were summed up in a "mellifluous name", "the usual experiences of a Virginian politician", and an earnest desire "to save somehow the remnants of his fortune"; and, finally, Alexander H. Stephens, whose "feeble allegiance to the secession cause" was not strong enough to overcome his antipathy to Jefferson Davis and who saw in presidents, North and South, "nothing but dynasties and despotisms" which peace alone could destroy.

Behind these lesser figures stand the figures of Lincoln and Davis. Neither of them, it must be said, played such a part in the peace movements as to convince one of his sincere desire to arrive at peace by negotiations. Lincoln, refusing in 1864 to budge one inch from "the position assumed" on the slavery question in 1863, appears more concerned about his consistency, and Davis, stubbornly closing his ears to any peace terms short of absolute independence, more intent upon his so-called "honor", than they were to make peace. Each was quite willing to use the "peacemakers" to jockey his rival into untenable positions which might weaken him with his constituents, but each persistently laid down terms as a basis for negotiations which he knew the other would not accept. It is clear that neither expected such negotiations to lead to peace.

As a story the book leaves little to be desired; from the opening sentence the reader's interest does not wane throughout the 250 pages of brilliant narrative. The style is vigorous, epigrammatic; a word, a phrase, a clause, and some obscure historical personage lives and moves before us a man of flesh and blood and passions. One might think, however, that since the author considers that the "problem of public morale" was "the decisive factor which denied victory to the Confederacy", he should have laid greater emphasis on the peace movements and peacemakers in the South. Careless proof-reading is responsible for a few errors which however are not of sufficient importance to mar an otherwise excellent work.

R. D. W. CONNOR.

*A History of the United States since the Civil War.* By ELLIS PAXSON OBERHOLTZER. Volume III. (New York: Macmillan. 1926. Pp. x, 529. \$4.00.)

MR. OBERHOLTZER's lively third volume covers the years 1872-1878 and through eight chapters deals in characteristic fashion with the rise of opposition to the administration of President Grant, culminating in the bizarre Greeley campaign, the decline and fall of the carpet-bagger in the South, the continuance of evil conditions in national affairs under the domination of the surviving radical leaders, the Hayes-Tilden campaign, and the beginnings of the Hayes administration. Somewhat apart from the main account, an informing chapter on the West tells the story of the expansion of the cattlemen, the gold-hunters, and the farmers and the fate of the Indians hemmed in by the whites and starved under the guardianship of the Indian Bureau. The lonely last chapter is not a record of badness but changes to the pleasanter subjects of letters and art.

The author, as is his custom, makes much use of newspapers, pamphlets, public documents, biographical material, political party pronouncements, and the manuscript collections in the Library of Congress. Deliberately or otherwise he avoids following the path opened by Dunning

and Rhodes but he examines the same problems from different angles. As a result there is an appearance of superficiality in this account as compared with those of the writers mentioned. There is little moralizing, there are no ponderous judgments as in Rhodes and little keen characterization as in Dunning. And one might object that not enough attention is devoted to the constructive economic and social forces in American life which were preparing the way for a more genuine reconstruction. For the most part this volume is a long record of bad government and corruption in all parts of the country, of conditions brought about by the rather complete breakdown of administration under an honest but naïve and politically incompetent chief executive. It is a clear and vivid account of the strong fight made by able radical leaders to continue against rising opposition the Congressional domination of the national government which began in 1866 and of the gradually decreasing scrupulousness of this leadership.

The outstanding features of the book are the exposures of "Grantism", the descriptions of the Greeley fiasco, the account of the efforts of Hayes to bring about reform within his party, and the portraits, some of them slightly dim and in the rogues gallery, of the major and minor personages in public life. Mr. Oberholtzer shows that the disorder in public life was due not only to the upheaval following the Civil War but also to the fact that the President was but a simple honest soldier, ignorant of politics, uncritically loyal to his curious friends and to his needy relatives, and possessed of an inferiority-complex which made him intolerant of the proper sort of advisors and associates. With a pathetic admiration of business success or its appearance, he was easily swayed by the attention and flattery of rich men and their representatives but had an instinctive aversion to leaders of the type of Schurz or Bristow. In time he came to be almost inaccessible except to the representatives of the corrupt forces in government and politics.

But while Mr. Oberholtzer, easily and with some evident pleasure in the job, shows that Grant was unfit to be President, no less enthusiastically does he prove that Greeley was even less fit. The campaign of 1872 offered a sorry choice to American voters.

Turning to Hayes, Oberholtzer, opening another window, lets a cleaner breeze blow through the muck of public life. Coming in when national disgrace had reached its lowest depths, Hayes worked slowly along some lines, more rapidly in other ways, in effecting constructive reforms, and, though compromising in smaller things, had the courage to break with half his party in order to carry out the "understanding of 1876". It is an amazing period pictured to us in this volume, when idealism and sentimentality, honesty and patriotism are harnessed for so long to the chariot of realism, selfishness, and corruption.

Although much evidence is exhibited of sounder political thinking and acting, which however is only by slow degrees effective, the evaluation of other strong forces of economic and social convalescence and progress



plainly lies outside the plan of the volume. This account of the dreary closing years of the ten-year period of "reconstruction", when the best of statesmanship was demanded and only low partizanship was available, would leave the reader with a disagreeable taste did not Mr. Oberholtzer oblige with a pleasant draught at the end when he briefly sketches the state of art and letters, of colleges and universities, of great newspapers and monthly magazines. These are better indications of the true American spirit than are the Indian Bureau, the District of Columbia ring, and the work of the Joint Committee on Reconstruction.

WALTER L. FLEMING.

*A History of Minnesota.* By WILLIAM WATTS FOLWELL. In four volumes. Volume III. (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society. 1926. Pp. x, 605. \$5.00.)

THE last sixty years of the life of any mid-western state like Minnesota constitute a relatively long period comparable with several hundred years of the history of a like area in the Old World remote from the seaboard and from the national capital or centre of population. The period of Minnesota history, 1865-1925, which is dealt with from the political and administrative point of view in this volume, illustrates how many swift changes in politics, society, and personalities may be crowded into the years of the early maturity of a great state as it turns steadily from a simple pioneer agricultural status to the complex conditions and relations of a great manufacturing, milling, lumbering, and mining commonwealth.

Admirable sections deal with certain phases of state-making more or less common to the northern tier of states carved out of the West after 1830—internal improvements, exploitation of natural resources, "land grabbing" especially by railroads, railroad regulation, inequities and burdens of taxation, and immigration. The history of these, state by state, must be a composite study, a mosaic, each part indispensable to a complete understanding. It is peculiarly fortunate that this study has been made by a man who occupied a position of prominence in this state for all these sixty years, save the first two, and whose poise, scholarship, judgment, and clarity of vision have remained trustworthy throughout.

Some of the significant things which went on in the political life of the semi-adolescent state of Minnesota, whose population of 250,000 in 1865 grew to 2,387,000 in 1920 of whom about seventy per cent. were of foreign birth or foreign parentage (some 500,000 were of German or Austrian stock when the great war began), are here set forth in illuminating and helpful fashion. The interplay of economic forces and acute immediate partizan purposes, the tug of racial loyalties, and the contests for power among strong, versatile, ambitious men like Ramsay, Donnelly, W. D. Washburn, Knute Nelson, and Kellogg, all of whom were long and well known personally by the author, are discussed with gratifying



conciseness and a rare quality of judicious appraisal. Much appears in the 322 pages of the text of the volume and almost as much in the nineteen voluminous and diverse appendixes which fill 254 pages and deal in considerable detail with senatorial contests, impeachments, law-suits, census frauds, mutiny, the Minnesota Commission on Public Safety during the great war, and the like.

Even if the reader is irked by the miscellaneous and disconnected contents of the fifteen chapters which are arranged mainly by gubernatorial administrations, he is certain to admire the author's power of summary and interpretation, his discrimination in the use of the vast resources of his personal experience and amassed historical materials, and the fullness and seeming accuracy of the foot-notes which result from the joint efforts of the author and the editorial assistants. Good illustrations of these qualities are found in the chapters on Railroad Regulation and the Grangers (II.), the Grasshopper Invasion, 1873-1877 (IV.), and Johnson and his Times, 1905-1909 (XIV.).

An ungentle critic might question the justification for including in a state history the details of the progress of the movements (leading to the adoption of the eighteenth and nineteenth amendments to the federal Constitution, pp. 300-306) in which Minnesota took small part beyond adopting the amendments and later furnishing the chairman of the judiciary committee of the House of Representatives whose name distinguishes the Volstead Act. Similarly the amazing and picturesque frauds and rascalities of John Hamilton, "Lord Gordon Gordon", hardly deserve an appendix of twenty-six pages.

The make-up of this volume, the high value of the illustrations and maps, and the excellence of its editing command the same hearty praise as did the preceding volumes of this notable state history.

KENDRIC C. BABCOCK.

*A History of Barbados, 1625-1685.* By VINCENT T. HARLOW, M.A., B.Litt., Lecturer in Modern History in the University College, Southampton. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1926. Pp. xviii, 347. \$7.00.)

MR. HARLOW'S carefully documented volume is mainly a political history of early Barbados. It deals chiefly with the personalities, services, and intrigues of successive proprietary and royal governors: the Wilmoughbys, Atkins, Dutton, and others. Only the last two, of seven, chapters and brief appendixes segregate for treatment certain institutional, economic, and social phases: trade with New England, labor, local government, and population. The sources are primarily manuscripts in the Public Record Office, British Museum, Bodleian Library, Trinity College, Dublin, and the Davis collection of Barbadian transcripts at the Royal Colonial Institute. To these the author shows scrupulous fidelity and his generalizations and judgments are restrained and well balanced.

The work is highly valuable and for the period covered supersedes Edwards and Schomburgk. Among recent histories it should be studied in connection with the more comprehensive investigation of the proprietary controversy in J. A. Williamson's *Caribbee Islands under Proprietary Patents* (Oxford, 1926, reviewed in *A. H. R.*, XXXII. 129, October, 1926).

The author narrates briefly the conflict over proprietary rights between Courteen and the Earl of Carlisle, confirming Williamson's conclusions as to the validity of Courteen's claims, though Carlisle's were officially sustained. Ensuing factional feuds, 1630-1640, retarded economic development. Commercial policy from almost the beginning was parental, tending through orders in Council to check tobacco culture in favor of provisions and to prohibit trade with foreigners. During the Puritan Rebellion Barbados, though mainly royalist, sought neutrality in hope of retaining markets in both sections of England. With sugar as her new staple and open trade with the Dutch under Governor Bell, Barbados prospered and achieved virtual independence. The influx of royalists, however, carried the colony into avowed loyalty to Charles II. and the island found itself at war with a victorious Parliament. Profoundly interesting to a student of imperialism are Barbadian pronouncements at this period (*e.g.*, pp. 65, 98, *et seq.*) in favor of colonial political and commercial autonomy in opposition to the new parliamentary sovereignty. For such a constitutional viewpoint as McIlwain and R. G. Adams developed in studies of the American Revolution these are highly significant. But such aspirations for what might be called dominion status practically perished in the victory of Ayscue's fleet (1651), followed by a treaty in which parliamentary sovereignty was grudgingly conceded. Barbados's lucrative trade with the Dutch during the Civil War was a factor in causing the Navigation Act of 1651 whose effects are traced with the conclusion that the island suffered from this and later navigation laws and sought relief in illicit trade. Barbadian population and wealth were also sacrificed by Cromwell in the Penn-Venables expedition and subsequent colonization of Jamaica. During the Protectorate, nevertheless, Barbados escaped proprietary control, and autonomy in local affairs increased.

With the Restoration the proprietary rights of Carlisle, meanwhile sold to Lord Francis Willoughby and "mortgaged" to creditors, were confirmed. Unrest as to the validity of titles and the prospect of proprietary exploitation ensued. The result was that in 1662 Barbados became a royal colony and titles were confirmed; in return for which the revenue from the famous  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. export duty, granted by Barbados in 1663, was to be divided between Willoughby and the creditors. In 1668 all this revenue reverted to the Crown. The subsequent fiscal history, till its repeal in 1798, centres in controversy over the true purpose of the  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. duty. Barbadians insisted with reason that defense and colonial expenses be paid from it, a plea ignored by Charles II., whose

use of the fund was generally irresponsible, dishonest, and oppressive. Perennial disputes between assemblies and governors over appointments, grants, charges of corruption, and extensions of royal prerogative in the interest of efficiency characterize the remainder of the Restoration period. Interesting glimpses are afforded by the activity of the Gentlemen Planters of London, serving as a lobby more and more in the interest of absentee proprietors. For Barbados, between 1650 and 1685, through exhaustion of cheap land, capitalistic agriculture, and white emigration was transformed from a community of English yeomen into a dependency of great estates worked almost wholly by slaves. Such a society, ever menaced with negro rebellion, was little disposed to repeat or insist upon the democratic ideals of free white pioneers of a Puritan age. Aristocratic planters found safety in imperial consolidation while prophets of political liberty sought a more spacious and freer frontier.

FRANK W. PITMAN.

*A History of the Cuban Republic: a Study in Hispanic American Politics.* By CHARLES E. CHAPMAN, Ph.D. (New York: Macmillan. 1927. Pp. xiv, 685. \$5.00.)

ALTHOUGH the title of Professor Chapman's volume announces that it is "a history of the Cuban Republic", the author has had in mind the limitations of the casual reader as well as the requirements of the scholar, and has prefaced his study of the republican era with a survey of the island's history from the time of its discovery by Columbus to the day in May, 1902, when General Leonard Wood turned the reins of government over to Cuba's first elected president, Don Tomás Estrada Palma. To the scholar this portion of the book should prove invaluable since it discusses, briefly, but with insight and exactness, the various steps in the building up of a spirit of nationalism in the Cuban people, and the vicissitudes that attended their struggle for freedom. Each chapter, in this part and in the body of the book, ends with a carefully prepared bibliography.

Any American who has pride in the idealism that led this country to intervene in Cuba's struggle with Spain for the purpose of ending the horrors of the War of Independence (1895-1898), which ended in setting Cuba up as a sovereign nation with the United States as its sponsor, will find little in Professor Chapman's four hundred-odd pages dealing with the republican era to reassure him that our action was wise, from the standpoint either of our own interests or those of Cuba.

The story Professor Chapman tells is one of almost incredible folly on the part of a people whose lovable qualities and whose virtues make the tragedy of their political incompetence all the more deplorable; and he tells the story with a dry conciseness, enlivened occasionally with flashes of humor, and a wealth of corroborative evidence, that carry the conviction of truth to the reader, despite the fantastically unreal nature of many of the events he deals with. In history, Professor Chapman has done for

the Latin American what O. Henry did for him in fiction. He relates how one Cuban president, whose achievements during the Cuban War of Independence were not of such nature as to single him out from a hundred other "generals" for fame, had had painted on the walls of the Presidential Mansion a glorified portrait of a minor battle in which this president participated, showing him in a heroic pose at the head of his troops. Of another Cuban president, who through chicanery had secured a government stipend of \$6000 a year for writing the history of Cuba, and who promised to gather "a veritable treasure of historical documents" (without, of course, having any intention of ever setting pen to paper), Chapman says: "It would seem that Zayas 'earned' only some twenty thousand dollars out of his 'history', but what other 'historian' was ever paid at an equally generous rate? . . . [He] was wholly lacking in five-hundred-dollars-a-month historical technique."

Quite the most interesting feature of Professor Chapman's volume is the forthrightness of the author's descriptions of the vice, the corruption, and the greed of Cuban governmental officials of all degrees. A spade is a spade with him, and he feels under no compulsion to search for innocuous synonyms. As a muck-raker—and this history certainly places him in that category—he is as fearless, as exact-minded, and as thorough as the best of the muck-rakers of twenty years ago; and he possesses, besides, a historical technic superior to that of any of the muck-rakers. Where the average historian would have been held back by consideration of the laws of libel, Professor Chapman goes ahead boldly describing in detail the most unconscionable raids on the Cuban treasury, apparently with no more qualms than if he were writing of a tea-party. For example, one character who makes a brief appearance in his pages is characterized as a "bookseller, who accumulated a fortune through graft in supplying books and other materials for the schools, and added to it by famous deals in public works and sanitation contracts with the state". Again, after a scathing denunciation of Cuba's third president, who is still alive, Chapman dismisses him with: "The least becoming thing in Menocal's eight-year rule was the manner of his passing—his handling of the elections of 1920, which were even more scandalously stolen than were those of 1916." And again: "Between March 1 and October 6, 1920, . . . Menocal pardoned 335 criminals, including forty-four murderers, in order to use them as gunmen and bullies and to get the value of their 'family influence'." Of another president, José Miguel Gomez, after devoting pages to discussing the crimes of violence allegedly inspired by Gomez, he adds, rather mildly: "A president like Gomez in a country with more wholesome political traditions would deserve unqualified praise. He could not have prevented bad political practices, even if he had desired to do so, for he had to rely upon a horde of self-seekers whose idea of 'patriotism' was to gather in the fruits of office for themselves. . . . He never went quite so far in improprieties as it would have been possible for him to go."

Quite the choicest of the author's phrases of denunciation are reserved for President Zayas, who held office between 1921 and 1925, and during whose administration "a 'new low' in shameless political depravity was attained, farther down than the worst stages of the Menocal regime". Zayas entered the presidency, the author says, a poor man, but "this was not because he was not willing to engage in any scandalous affair that would yield him a sure return". (In four years, on a salary of \$25,000 annually, he "saved" an estimated \$4,000,000.) Professor Chapman quotes a statement by a "distinguished" but anonymous Cuban to the effect that Zayas is "a degenerate, with especially morbid sensual proclivities", and quotes a newspaper article which assigns to Zayas "the sad honor of having been the first President to quote a market price on his signature, at times very low,—pardons, small transactions, etc.,—at other times a little dear, as in the case of the Malecon affair".

Corruption, writes Professor Chapman, has eaten away the public conscience of Cuba. The executive has been continuously venal and incompetent, the Congress thoroughly vicious, the judiciary bad almost without exception. Nowhere is there even a promise of a better day. Worst of all, he states, the public school system has been allowed to go to ruin and to-day illiteracy is higher than it has been for a generation. In summary, he writes:

"What is the meaning of all this? In a word, that the evils of the colonial era live on. For a little while the ideals engendered by the struggle for independence held the politicians in check, but the Latin memory is short, and soon afterward the old materialism and personalism of Spanish days reasserted themselves. By the close of the Zayas administration they had probably outdistanced their colonial prototype. A number of important reforms might be suggested for the correction of existing evils, but it would probably be a waste of ink to set them down. Even if adopted, they would not change things one iota, for the trouble is not in the laws or the Constitution but in the men who are at the helm in political affairs. Instead of disinterested statesmen, the republic has developed a governmental class which is an incubus upon the life of the island. It is to be hoped that this reign of political parasitism marks only a transitional stage—the storm before the calm—but it cannot be allowed to grow much worse, or the Cuban Republic will be past saving."

WILLIAM E. SHEA.

#### MINOR NOTICES

*The Founders of Seismology.* By Charles Davison, Sc.D., F.G.S. (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan, 1927, pp. xiv, 240, 12 s. 6 d.) Whoever essays to write on an historical subject must find himself at once confronted with the question of when, with whom, or with what incident he is to make his beginning. In the work under consideration Dr. Davison has solved his problem by supposing "the birth of seismology to date from the middle of the eighteenth century",

and in the 240 pages of his work has given an interesting and concise history of world-wide earthquake phenomena with brief biographical sketches of the men who have devoted their lives, wholly or in part, to their study. Beginning with brief references to John Bevis (1692-1771) he considers chronologically and chapter by chapter, with incidental reference to their contemporaries, John Mitchell (1725?-1793), who he thinks has just claim to be considered one of the founders of seismology, Alexis Perry (1807-1882), who made the first serious attempt to catalogue the literature of earthquakes, and Robert Mallet (1810-1881) whose were the first really scientific investigations on the subject.

In chapters VI. to VIII. the author treats of the study of earthquakes in Italy, Central France, and the United States, but with chapter IX. he returns to the original method of presentation of the subject and the three final chapters are devoted chiefly to the work of Ferdinand de Montessus de Ballore (1851-1923), John Milne (1850-1913), and Fusakichi Omori (1868-1923), the first noted particularly for his bibliographic researches, the second as the founder of the Seismological Society of Japan and for his two great catalogues of Japanese earthquakes, and the third for his efforts in foretelling earthquakes and the prevention of disaster through the construction of earthquake-proof buildings.

The change in manner of presentation of the subject matter noted in chapters VI., VII., and VIII. is at first confusing and seemingly accountable only on the ground that no one name stands out above the many others. However this may be, the information is there, plainly and concisely stated, and with abundant foot-notes for verification, if desired. So far as relates to the subject in hand, one can only say that it would be difficult to crowd more within the same number of pages. The volume is in the form of a small octavo of modest appearance and with few illustrations—mostly diagrams and outline maps. It is printed on thick, unglazed paper, is of light weight, and so bound that it will lie open upon one's desk without the nuisance of weights. As one of the latest of the numerous history of science series, written or contemplated, the reviewer is inclined to regard this volume as a distinct success.

GEORGE P. MERRILL.

*The History and Civilization of Ancient Megara.* By E. L. Highbarger, Ph.D. Part I. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, no. 2.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1927, pp. xv, 220, \$2.50.) Literary sources for the history of Megara are sadly scanty; unfortunately no native Megarian record has come down to us and the city has suffered not a little through misrepresentation on the part of hostile Athenian critics. Methodical excavations on an adequate scale have not yet been undertaken and archaeological research has yielded disappointingly little. All the material however has been carefully assembled by the author of the volume here under review, and from it he has woven together a consecutive account of the history and civilization of Megara



from earliest prehistoric times down to 146 B. C. A second part, in preparation, will complete the history, contain special discussions, and also include a *Prosopographia Megarensis*.

Since it is hardly meant for the general reader nor as a text-book, the monograph might have been reduced not a little in bulk by the omission of a good many rather elementary foot-notes. The chapter on topography might have been improved by a visit to Megara; there is some looseness in the use of the term "Isthmus" (p. 144 and elsewhere); the implication that the *Diolkos* lay in Megarian territory (p. 102) is rather startling, and it is certainly odd to speak (p. 156) of the Corinthians invading the Isthmus; the two hills Caria and Alcathoa are only about half the height of Acrocorinth (p. 9, n. 23); the photograph of the shore of "Nisaea" (pl. IV., p. 23) is wrongly labelled: it is taken from "Minoa" and the hills to the extreme right are the little islands of Pakhi and Pakhiaki, while it is Salamis that appears in the distant background.

The theory (pp. 83 f.) that Megara was the older settlement and the harbor town the later may be correct, but does not agree with the archaeological evidence at present available; for the earliest pottery (Early Helladic) has been found at Minoa, not at Megara itself. That Cretans in the Middle Minoan Period settled at some points on the mainland is very likely, but the suggestion that they came as the civilizing "Minyans" (p. 76) will hardly meet with acceptance. Nor can the presence of sherds of "Late Minoan III." at Minoa be used (p. 96) to prove such an invasion; for they belong to a period when the Palace at Cnossus had been destroyed and Crete itself was being overrun from the mainland. Pottery of Late Minoan I. and II. will doubtless be found at Minoa however if excavations are undertaken. In the light of present-day knowledge one can not safely regard geometric ware (p. 98) as characteristic of the Dorians. Theagenes, like other contemporary tyrants, constructed a magnificent water system and perhaps other public monuments, but it is surely an overstatement to say that Megara was without a superior in the Greek world in the building of aqueducts.

These are, after all, criticisms of details; Highbarger's work is painstaking and conscientious and his collection of material will prove of value to the historian, though the latter may not always accept the interpretation offered here.

CARL W. BLEGEN.

*Polybios: Lebens- und Weltanschauung aus dem Zweiten Vorchristlichen Jahrhundert.* Von Dr. Carl Wunderer. [Das Erbe der Alten, Heft XII.] (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1927, pp. viii, 79.) Professor Wunderer, the well-known author of *Polybios-Forschungen*, writes thus in his introduction (vii): "Polybios stands at the turning-point of a new epoch. . . . It will always be difficult to pass final judgment; and this judgment moreover will vary according to the political point of view of individuals. This, however, does not prevent one from making an in-



quiry into his (Polybius's) real character and learning what he has to offer to our own times."

The author is therefore well aware of the difficulty of the critic's task in the case of a man like Polybius who combines the qualities of both a political philosopher and a historian. But he nevertheless has succeeded in giving a fine picture of Polybius's career in eight short chapters, which also consider his conception of life, moral sentiments, and psychological and esthetic views. At the same time this monograph also constitutes a defense of Polybius against the carping criticisms of various modern scholars (compare notes 4, 44) as well as of Greek historiography in general, especially against the destructive criticism of Oswald Spengler (*The Decline of the West*, see p. 10 of the English translation and chapter IV., "The Problem of World History", pp. 117-160).

Since the book belongs to a series aiming to trace the *Wesen und Wirken der Antike* (a series reminding one of *Our Debt to Greece and Rome*), modern parallels and comparisons are not lacking. To quote an example: Polybius is likened to Moltke (p. 54). Whether this comparison is happy or presumptuous it is difficult to say. I may conclude that the monograph clearly shows that the author read Polybius and the literature he quotes with discernment, that it is written with sympathy and breadth of view, and that it is a pity that he did not live to see its publication. It is a coincidence worthy of note that a short time after its appearance an American scholar, Professor E. G. Sihler, published in the *American Journal of Philology* (XLVIII., 1927, 38-81) a learned paper entitled "Polybius of Megalopolis".

JACOB HAMMER.

*The Teaching of the Early Church on the Use of Wine and Strong Drink.* By Irving Woodworth Raymond, Ph.D. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, no. 286.] (New York, Columbia University Press, 1927, pp. 170, \$3.00.) This competent, though somewhat heavy-footed, treatise covers a wider field than its title suggests. The first chapter deals at length with the Jewish teaching in the Old Testament, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Philo, and the rabbinic literature, while the second chapter covers the Greek and Roman moralists and philosophers. Thus about one-half of the book is given to what, judging from the title, is simply background.

It is perhaps a consequence of this apportionment of space that the third chapter, on the New-Testament teaching, is so brief that the most important passage, St. Paul's teaching in Romans xiv, concerning abstinence from meat and drink for the sake of the weak brethren, is handled with a brevity and vagueness surprising in view of the unique importance of this passage for the Christian teaching from earliest days until now.

The last three chapters, on the Eastern and Western fathers and monastic and secular ecclesiastical discipline, are the best, and bring out

clearly the development of a higher and lower morality in this as in other branches of Christian ethics. The great influence of Hellenistic ethical teachers on the early Christian fathers, both of East and West, is admirably illustrated in this matter of drunkenness, temperance, and abstinence. Dr. Raymond also brings out clearly the new, distinctively Christian elements in the patristic teaching.

He draws a sharp distinction between the ascetic total abstinence commended in varying degrees by all six of the orthodox fathers whose teaching he gives in detail, and the asceticism of such heretical sects as the Encratites and of such rival religions as Manichaeism. It is certainly true that the justification of total abstinence by Augustine is very different from the dualistic Manichaean position. But the difference in logic seems less significant than the similarity in ascetic practice which reveals the mighty influence of the ascetic tide that swept over the Roman Empire in the early centuries of our era, and carried with it orthodox and heretic, Christian and pagan teachers alike. The evidence of the canons is a needed reminder that in spite of this asceticism drunkenness and moderate drinking remained the popular practice.

N. B. NASH.

*Sanctus, Essai sur le Culte des Saints dans l'Antiquité.* Par Hippolyte Delehaye. (Brussels, Société des Bollandistes, 1927, pp. viii, 265.) This work may be looked on as a supplement to another book by the same author which appeared in 1912, *Les Origines du Culte des Martyrs*. In both the purpose of the author is the same, namely, to find reliable grounds on which to base definite conclusions regarding the data and terminology of the science of hagiography. This science concerns itself solely with the saints. In the course of centuries, this title or designation, "saint", came to have a fixed meaning in liturgical and hagiographical language. Before it received any official meaning, however, the word had been in common use in Christian communities as a term of honor for persons whose lives exemplified in an extraordinary degree the Christian code of perfection. Father Delehaye traces the steps by which the word passed from popular to official use, and points out its value at different stages in its history as a description of the quality or attribute by which the saint merits his title. In the first and second of the six chapters into which the book is divided there is an exhaustive investigation from pagan as well as from Christian sources of the primitive and popular meaning of the word *sanctus* and of other related terms such as *beatus*, *dominus*, *martyr*, and *confessor*. Inasmuch as saints were known to be such because of the honors they received and the veneration in which they were held, a chapter is devoted to the "culte" of the saints. Next there is a discussion of the lists and official rosters of the saints, and, inasmuch as these martyrologies and official lists were not always reliable, there is also a chapter with the strange heading, *Saints who Never Existed*. The last chapter is somewhat specu-

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXIII.—12.

lative in character. It contains an historical analysis of "sanctity", the quality or attribute towards which the saints directed their efforts and struggles. It is clear that in undertaking this task the author set himself definite limits, and he is to be congratulated for having remained within them. A work on the same subject drawn from the entire field of comparative religion might be eagerly welcomed, but it would not have the distinctive character and charm of this monograph, and it would lack its usefulness as an aid in the study of Christian hagiography. The work exhibits the typographical accuracy and elegance which are characteristic of Bollandist publications. The name of the author is sufficient guaranty of its accuracy and worth.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

*Weltgeschichte als Machtgeschichte, 382-911, die Zeit der Reichsgründungen.* Von Alexander Cartellieri, o. ö. Professor an der Universität Jena. (Munich and Berlin, R. Oldenbourg, 1927, pp. xvi, 398, unbound 18.50 M., bound 20 M.) As the title indicates this book aims to present the story of the rise of new kingdoms out of the ruins of the Roman Empire from the point of view of the concept of might. The author holds that the eternal struggle for power is an unchanging characteristic of all human experience.

Cartellieri takes as the point of transition from mere settlements of wandering tribes to the definite founding of a Germanic kingdom on Roman soil the compact made by Theodosius I. with the Visigoths on October 3, 382. He presents his subject matter in four books: I. the Germanic Foundings of Kingdoms (382-611); II. the Arabian Kingdoms and the Rise of the Frankish Kingdom (611-774); III. the Great Kingdom of the Franks (774-843); IV. the Downfall of the Great Kingdoms of the Franks and of the Arabs (843-911).

"Men make history", says the author, "but history too makes men." And we find in his pages many striking embodiments of power, notably Alaric, Theodoric, and Charles the Great. The outstanding example of *Machtgeschichte* is found in the great realm of Charles: the third section of his volume marks a climax.

The most significant cause for the dissolution of the kingdoms of the West and East alike is to be found, Cartellieri believes, in the exhaustion of the powers of the Franks and of the Arabs; for races, like individuals, may overexert themselves.

Together with the story of the rise and the decline of these various Germanic powers—Visigoths, Vandals, Ostrogoths, Lombards, Franks—and their rivalry with each other and with the Arabs, the writer portrays the effect of the persistence of the Eastern Roman Empire, a bulwark against the aggression of Asia, and of the continuation of the Roman idea of empire in the papacy.

Cartellieri declares that it is the function of history as a science to make no statements for which there is not sufficient evidence in the

sources. He prefers, however, to point the way back to these through the secondary literature, and his brief notes consist entirely of references to modern historical works. There is a full bibliography which includes editions of the sources as well as general works, monographs, and periodicals. The book contains also a complete index of proper names.

Cartellieri writes in a clear and interesting style and has dealt in masterly fashion with a difficult period of history. However much one may deplore the presentation of events from this single and somewhat narrow point of view, the fact remains that we have here a very real contribution to the historical literature of the period.

CHARLES CHRISTOPHER MIEROW.

*The Wandering Scholars.* By Helen Waddell. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927, pp. xxviii, 292, \$5.00.) This volume is better described by its preface than by its title. "It was begun as an introduction to a book of translations from mediaeval Latin lyric, soon to be published, and outgrew the original intention, without outgrowing its limitations. The historical interest of the *Vagantes* as one of the earliest disintegrating forces in the mediaeval church has been left on one side; with it, their place in literary history, in the development of satire and the secularizing of the stage. They have been studied only as the inheritors of the pagan learning, the classic tradition that came to its wild flowering in the rhyming Latin lyric of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries." What we have is not a study of the *goliardi*, who appear toward the middle of the book, but an essay on the medieval Latin lyric from Ausonius to the Archpoet, with a good deal of more or less pertinent matter on the life of the medieval student, particularly in northern France. The volume should be judged as a literary essay rather than as a piece of historical research. Still the author knows her printed texts, though few of the manuscripts, and has used the principal monographs. She has an excellent literary background, ancient and modern, and likes to quote Rabelais and find Chinese parallels to Ausonius. Best of all for her purpose, she loves poetry "in the ageless and marmoreal tongue", and can turn it skilfully into English.

There are some indications of too rapid work, besides the proof-reading and the failure to make fuller use of unpublished material. Thus we have no evidence that Adelard of Bath visited Egypt or that Thierry of Chartres lectured on the new Aristotle "just translated from the Arabic" (p. 110). Nor was the new Aristotle burned at Paris in 1215 (p. 52). Since Schmeidler's criticism scholars no longer use the letters of Heloise with unshaken confidence. To say (p. 67) that Gerbert was "greater even than Nicholas Breakspear" is to take the one English pope pretty seriously. But it is more just, as well as more pleasant, to cite some of Miss Waddell's many quotable phrases, such as the generalization that the medieval scholar had "no sense of perspective, but a strong sense of continuity"; or its illustration that "to have fought on the right

side at Troy was to have come over with the Conqueror". Nor is she lacking in appreciation of the quotable remarks of others. Witness her use (p. 130) of the admission of Giraldus Cambrensis that he "was a young man of extraordinary charm"; and the proof (p. xix) of the vitality of the pagan tradition by the example of the marble Venus which Master Gregory saw at Rome: "And because of her amazing beauty and I know not what magical persuasion I was drawn three times to visit her, though she was distant two miles from my lodging."

A fascinating book most readers will find this, for with all its sophistication it has grace and charm as well, and its nimble wit and happy renderings of Latin verse draw the unfamiliar reader into some real touch with medieval life. Nor does the author claim too much for her theme: "In the last resort, the mediaeval scholar's lyric has value only for those to whom the richest thing in life is the sense of the past." In other words, it is comparative literature, not superlative.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

*Anatomical Texts of the Earlier Middle Ages: a Study in the Transmission of Culture.* By George W. Corner, M.D., Professor of Anatomy in the University of Rochester. (Washington, Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1927, pp. 112; paper, \$1.00; cloth, \$1.50.) The twelfth century was a period of great activity in Western Europe, spiritual as evidenced by the Crusades, material as shown in the multitude of buildings which now rose white from the mason's hand. The University of Paris and the Schools of Oxford bear witness to another phase and while Saint Leonard's Hospital at York shows us unchanged the material environment of medicine 800 years ago, Saint Bartholomew's in London maintains unbroken the tradition of healing as well.

The wisdom of the fathers in medicine had become available for Christendom, by a strange freak of history, through the industry of the East. Constantine the African had translated, in the eleventh century, an Arabic version of Hippocrates with Galen's commentary together with more recent Oriental authors. But in the linguistic complications resulting from repeated translations small wonder if something were lost and other things twisted by clerks out of all recognition.

Dr. Corner reveals to us the industry and zeal of the later Salernitan anatomists, not mere pedagogues delivering orations, but active workers in their science. Behind them were the translations of Constantine and the heavy hand of tradition but they were surprisingly free from the Arabic deference to authority. The volume is invaluable to all those who attempt to trace for their own benefit and that of their pupils the continuity of anatomical thought and industry from Galen to Vesalius. The translations are carefully and even ingeniously carried out. There will be critics, no doubt, of debatable detail, for a faithful and not unwieldy translation which at the same time truly retains the spirit of the original is a task by no means easy. Dr. Corner has done it well and

deserves the gratitude of a generation of physicians to whom even medieval English is a trial and medieval Latin a sheer impossibility.

T. WINGATE TODD.

*Les Prophecies de Merlin*. Edited from MS. 593 in the Bibliothèque Municipale of Rennes, by Lucy Allen Paton. Part I., Introduction and Text; part II., Studies in the Contents. [Monograph Series of the Modern Language Association of America.] (New York, D. C. Heath and Company; London, Oxford University Press, 1927, pp. xl, 496, iv, 406, \$9.00.) Part I. contains the text of the *Prophecies* from the Rennes manuscript, with elaborate collations and with selections (48 pages) from Verard's print of 1498. In her introduction Miss Paton arranges the fifteen manuscripts of the French text of the *Prophecies* in four groups and defines their relationship to one another and also to the manuscripts and early editions of *La Storia di Merlino*, as the Italian version of the *Prophecies* was styled.

Part II. deals with the problems of the date, authorship, and purpose of the *Prophecies* and discusses the branches of Arthurian romance with which it is specially connected. Miss Paton concludes that the *Prophecies* was compiled in Venice (or at least by a Venetian) between 1276 and 1279. The ascription in the manuscripts to "Maistre Richart d'Irlande" she dismisses as a literary fiction. The author, who was probably a Franciscan, clearly betrays his sympathy with the Guelphs, and repeatedly mentions the "contumacy" of the Emperor Frederic II.

*Les Prophecies* contributes but little new information concerning the Merlin legend. The author makes no direct use of Geoffrey of Monmouth or other early sources, but draws his Arthurian material chiefly from the prose *Lancelot* and *Palamedes*. The main interest and importance of this document consists in the series of historical prophecies which has been fitted into this Arthurian frame. These prophecies, purposely cryptic, Miss Paton by keen and thoroughgoing research has succeeded in deciphering; she finds that for the most part they are concerned with events in thirteenth-century Italy rather than with ancient Britain.

Thus interpreted, these fantastic *dicta* put into the mouth of Merlin have historical value, for, as Miss Paton observes, they "may reasonably be utilized as one of the means at our disposal for bringing the life of the period more vividly before us". The truth of this statement is amply illustrated in her chapters on the "Bons Mariniers", the "Guerres es Parties de Jherusalem", and the "Marche Amoureuse". In the life of the Church, also, prophecy has played its part, from the Apocalypse of St. John down to the Adventist preaching of modern times. One of the most interesting manifestations of this vaticinal mysticism in the Middle Ages was that expressed in "Joachism" and the "Everlasting Gospel". Miss Paton shows that the author of *Les Prophecies de Merlin*, though he discreetly refrains from endorsing the doctrines of Joachim, which had been condemned as heretical, still echoes many of his teachings and resembles him also in vigorously attacking abuses in the Church:



In her study of the historical background of these prophecies Miss Paton displays an acuteness of perception and a familiar acquaintance with recondite sources which is as notable as the painstaking accuracy and thoroughness which she employs in her critical study of the text. Her work is a monument of research which exemplifies the finest traditions of American scholarship.

*Chartulary of Winchester Cathedral.* Edited in English by A. W. Goodman, B.D., F.S.A., Librarian of the Cathedral. (Winchester, Warren and Son, Ltd., 1927, pp. lxviii, 284, 25 s.) Of the three extant chartularies of the church of Winchester, two are in the British Museum, the third remains in its original home. Or, rather, about half the chartulary is there; as regards the other half, Canon Goodman can only express the pious hope that "when some reader of this book sees the list of the lost documents [p. 236 f.] he should identify a MS. in his possession as our missing volume and generously restore it to its old home".

The present volume gives a *précis* of each document in the Winchester chartulary, varying in length from brief summaries to virtually complete translations, with, occasionally, the original French or Latin. The earliest documents belong to the tenth century, the latest to the year 1357. There is a wide variety of topics treated; the economic historian and his colleagues in social and constitutional history, quite as surely as the student of the history of the Church, may find material that is not without interest. The letter of excommunication issued by the monks of Canterbury against Grosseteste; the composition entered into by the prior of Winchester and city witnesses to terminate the quarrels between the convent and the townsfolk; and two contemporary narratives of the Poitiers campaign, may be mentioned as documents of especial interest in widely different fields.

In addition to his labors of translation and summarizing, Mr. Goodman has contributed an unusually informative introduction of fifty pages, and an index which, in so far as the present writer has tested it, is adequate and accurate. A synopsis of documents more than takes the place of a table of contents; and there are six illustrations, facsimile reproductions of pages of the chartulary.

It is unfortunate, in the judgment of the reviewer, that we are given an English calendar of the chartulary, and not the documents themselves, untranslated and *in extenso*. A volume of this sort is intended for specialists. But, having said that, the writer must add that Canon Goodman has earned the thanks of students of English history and set a high standard for editors.

A. H. SWEET.

*Une Vie de Cité: Paris, de sa Naissance à nos Jours.* Par Marcel Poëte. Tome II., *La Cité de la Renaissance.* (Paris, Auguste Picard, 1927, pp. 338, 35 fr.) This is the second volume of a work which was

favorably reviewed in this periodical two years ago. The present installment begins with "La Capitale Royale" about the time of the expulsion of the English as the Hundred Years' War drew to its close, and terminates with such topics as "Les Traits de la Cité Moderne", as these were developed in the age of Henry III. and Catherine de Médicis.

Here, it is right to say, is a work almost indispensable to the library of every earnest student of the Northern Renaissance. Paris played a great part in the so-called "Middle Ages", but probably not so great as in the century stretching from Charles VII. to Henry IV. The author has wisely resisted the temptation to write a history of France under the guise of tracing the annals of her chief city. On the contrary almost the whole weight is thrown on things cultural. The multitude of topics range from such things as "L'Imprimerie" (p. 27) as it localized itself in Paris in 1470, to the "Banquiers Italiens" (p. 313) who made themselves potent in the French financial world during the Wars of Religion. It is, in fact, rather hard to name a major subject relating to the religious, literary, artistic, or economic life of France at the close of the Middle Ages, which is not here illuminated by pages of very concrete information presented with faultless lucidity. A material part of the book is of course taken up with archaeological and architectural data, involving, *e.g.*, a meticulous reconstruction of the markets, bridges, and quays as well as the fortifications, churches, and secular buildings, as they existed in the sixteenth century.

All this makes the book a veritable boon to the reference worker. Unfortunately, however, for the advanced reader the work labors under the painful drawback of the first volume. Here is far too elaborate a study to make its most serious appeal to the non-technical public. It deserves therefore that proper reinforcement of careful foot-notes that is indispensable for serious students, who wish to check up the many significant statements which ought to find their way into other, more popular histories. These foot-notes are absolutely and deplorably lacking. A careful index is equally needful and equally lacking, but I assume that it will be supplied with the final volume. An elaborate and informing contemporary map of Paris in the middle of the sixteenth century was, however, published with the first volume, although it much more properly belongs with the one now under review.

WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS.

*The Libelle of Englyshe Polycye: a Poem on the Use of Sea-Power, 1436.* Edited by Sir George Warner, D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1926, pp. lvi, 126, 10 s. 6 d.) Considering the interest in this fifteenth-century poem shown by scholars for many years, it is perhaps surprising that it has had to wait so long for the thorough and scholarly editing which it has now received. Fifty years of interest in this particular poem, and forty years of official association with the department of manuscripts in the British Museum are the editor's qualifica-

tions for his task. It may easily be admitted that he has produced the definitive edition of the *Libelle*. It supersedes the edition in the Rolls Series, not only in being based on a collation of more than twice as many manuscripts, but also in providing a very extensive emendation and elucidation of the text. This should prove particularly useful to students of linguistics. A discussion of the language and the poetic form will be found in the introduction, a careful study of the metre is evidenced throughout, and the final sixth of the book is devoted to a glossary of the obsolete and unusual words and those used in a peculiar sense. It is notable how often the only example for the use of a word given in the *New English Dictionary* is a quotation from this poem.

For the historian the novel part of the present work is the discussion of authorship. In 1878 the editor suggested Adam Moleyns, clerk of the Council, as the possible author. Since then some scholars have accepted this suggestion sufficiently to repeat it. We now have the accumulated circumstantial evidence upon which this hypothesis rests. In the absence of any alternative theory it would appear that Sir George has made a case which most students will readily accept. He is, however, too cautious in his scholarship to be categorical. "On the evidence available, absolute proof cannot be expected, but although the reasons . . . given for attributing it to him may not be thought conclusive, the extent to which he satisfies all the necessary conditions is certainly remarkable." "Whoever [the author] was, among other qualifications for his task he had a genuine love for his country, sound political judgment, and an extensive knowledge of trade, and, whatever may be thought of some of his views on economic questions, his ideas on the subject of sea-power were in advance of his time." Incidentally the information on Moleyns which appears in the *Dictionary of National Biography* is here considerably augmented. Along with the discussion of authorship there is a careful study of the relation of the poem to the questions of English policy in 1436. There is also a demonstration that it was probably not addressed to Cardinal Beaufort (among others), as previous editors have assumed, but to Bishop Stafford, the chancellor.

RICHARD A. NEWHALL.

*Jacobi Acontii Satanae Stratagematum Libri Octo, Ad Johannem Wolphium eiusque ad Acontium Epistulae. Epistula Apologetica pro Adriano de Haemstede. Epistula ad Ignotum quendam de Natura Christi.* Editio critica. Curavit Gualtherus Koehler. (Munich, Ernest Reinhardt, 1927, pp. xv, 247.) Jacob Acontius was an Italian religious refugee of the sixteenth century, who sought an exile at Basel and later in England. The *Satanae Stratagemata* was first published in Basel in 1565, and developed the arguments for religious tolerance already advanced by such men as Erasmus, Sebastian Franck, Castellio, Ochino, and others. Acontius was perhaps an even more thorough Biblicalist than Luther, in that he would exclude from the Church only those who rejected doctrines

distinctly stated in Scripture to be necessary for salvation. In practice only the Roman Catholics would be eliminated because they make salvation dependent upon works instead of upon faith according to Scripture. The exclusion of the Sabellians, who logically denied that Christ is the Son of God, by making Him identical with the Father, is purely academic since the sect was extinct. All Protestant groups would be included, since predestination, the Lord's Supper, and baptism are not among the fundamentals.

The only penalty for rejection of the fundamentals should be exclusion from the Church. The magistrate should not proceed further with the sword, because he is not competent to judge theological questions, because force is ineffective, and simply makes heretics into hypocrites, and because constraint is positively harmful in that it restricts that liberty of prophesying which is the indispensable requisite for the discovery of the truth.

This work underwent many editions and translations into French, German, Dutch, and English, of which Koehler gives a complete bibliography with an account of where the copies are to be found in European libraries. Americans may be interested to know that numbers 11 and 13 of Koehler's list are at Cornell and number 8 at Yale. The Latin editions vary markedly and are here collated for the first time.

A number of letters are given, some hitherto unpublished. The one to Wolf appeared with the first edition of the *Stratagemata*, whose arguments it recapitulates. Biographically the most interesting is the letter to Archbishop Grindall, who had excommunicated Acontius from all the refugee congregations in England, because of his support of a certain Hambsted, who had said that a belief in the incarnation was not one of the fundamentals. Acontius did not deny the doctrine, but was merely in doubt as to whether it was comparable to a head, whose loss would be irreparable, or merely to a leg, which might be amputated without fatal results. (Cf. Schickler, *Les Églises du Réfuge en Angleterre*, I. 117-121.)

The material for a biography of Acontius is extremely scanty. What little exists is collected by Koehler in the Praefatio.

The influence of Acontius was first traced by Karl Mueller in his *Kirchengeschichte* (II. 2), where he pointed out the direct effect of the *Stratagemata* on the Socinians in Poland, the Remonstrants and Collegiants in Holland, and the Latitudinarians in England. Less directly such opponents as Laud and Cromwell were affected by the "Acontiusgeist", for the archbishop, though insisting on uniformity in ritual, allowed latitude in doctrine, and the Protector tolerated all save the Papists and Unitarians. One of the prefaces of the English translation of 1631 (at Cornell) is addressed to Cromwell.

*Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters.* Von Ludwig Freiherrn von Pastor. Band XI., *Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter*

*der Katholischen Reformation und Restauration, 1592-1605.* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, Herder, 1927, pp. xl, 804, 24 M.) Pope Clement VIII., to whose papacy (1592-1605) this volume is devoted, is the last whom Pastor reckons to the age of the Catholic reformation and restoration; and his significance, like that of Gregory XIII., is almost the discovery of this historian. To Protestant or free-thinking students of history his grim personality—partizan, repressive, devout—has had little for admiration or interest, and even Catholic writers have seemed to find his story dull. But to the research of Pastor, for whom this time of religious reaction was the bloom of papal history, there opens a wealth of fresh materials for the portrayal of its triumph. Clement had, he admits, nothing of the genius in method, the boldness of initiative, the unscrupulous energy, of Sixtus the Fifth. Yet it was of Sixtus that he was the spiritual heir; and, though his strength lay in another field, that of far-seeing policy and clever diplomacy, he slowly but steadily carried out the same aims. Worldly rule, however, had for him only the second place. In all his dealings he was first of all a priest, “the speaking image of a deeply religious over-shepherd”. “So was there personified in him the spirit of the Catholic Reformation, which then found in Filippo Neri its loveliest expression, that this saint, it was said, had with him mounted the papal throne.”

To Neri and his influence, to the administration of the Church and to the controversies which troubled her unity, much space is of course given. The pope's patronage of letters and the arts and his management of the Papal States, including the seizure of Ferrara, receive ample attention. But it is, above all, on the dealings of the papacy with the European powers—with her crafty convert on the throne of France and with cesaro-papal Spain, with the invading Turk and with chaotic Germany, with suspicious Holland and defiant Britain, and with the factions that struggled for mastery in Scandinavian and Slavic Europe—that the documents sifted for this volume throw most abundant light. Incidentally there fall some rays on the fortunes of religious freedom. The pope's devotion to the Holy Inquisition compels much attention from his historian. Eight pages go to the case of Giordano Bruno—but with, of course, no sympathy for that bold thinker. Interesting is what is told of the streamlets of heresy trickling through Venice; and Sarpi's relations with them seem already to have earned him the frown of the Church.

GEORGE L. BURR.

*L'Action Politique et Sociale des Avocats au Dix-Huitième Siècle.* Par Baron Francis Delbeke. (Louvain, Librairie Universitaire; Paris, Recueil Sirey, 1927, pp. xxvii, 302, 35 fr.) This is the first of a two-volume work which professes to study the *avocats* and men of law as the *vulgarisateurs* of the eighteenth-century philosophy. For the most part, the present volume is introductory in character. It passes in review the preparation of the lawyer for his professional life, the organization of

the bar, the lawyer's relations with the magistracy, his social position, and his liaisons with the Encyclopaedists. In a second volume, M. Delbeke proposes to describe the rôle of the lawyer in the public life of the country and his direct influence on the Revolution.

In the volume under review the author evaluates in a refreshing and illuminating manner the education given by the religious orders, the Jesuits in particular; he correlates convincingly the increase of the lawyer's prestige with the development of his oratorical prowess and the decline of the nobility in popular esteem; in analyzing the famous trials of Calas, Sirven, and de la Barre, he traces clearly the expansion of the Encyclopaedist spirit, as epitomized in Voltaire, from mere anti-clericalism to enthusiasm for comprehensive, if controlled, reform.

On the whole, however, the book is disappointing in that it does not fulfill the promise of the author's introduction. The reader is enticed by the prospect that this most important subject will receive a broad historical treatment; instead, the author indulges his legal propensities to an extent which the historian can not condone. Exactly one-third of the book is devoted to the technical details of the trials mentioned above. When, in the chapter on the *Avocats et l'Esprit Encyclopédiste*, the author leaves his favorite theme of legal procedure, he flounders hopelessly. Indeed, one suspects the adequacy of his historical background. To Baron Delbeke it is one of the enigmas of history (p. 282) that, in view of the general outcry among all classes, no minister, prior to 1780, had undertaken the reform of the criminal procedure. This reform could have been easily effected, says the Baron, for two reasons: first, because by resistance—and the implication is that resistance would have been inevitable—the Parlements would have shown that they placed their personal prerogatives above the "interests of the nation"; secondly, because the reforms thus envisaged were perhaps the only ones that could have been carried through without antagonizing some vested interest. To the student of the last years of the *ancien régime*, such reasoning will appear, at best, naïve.

DE FOREST VAN SLYCK.

*La Franc-Maçonnerie Française et la Préparation de la Révolution.* Par Gaston Martin. (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1926, pp. xvi, 294, 12 fr.) This book is one of the most important and most interesting contributions to the study of the French Revolution which have been made for twenty years. It describes the activities, the influence, and the responsibility of the French Freemasonry in the great and momentous events of the years 1788-1799. It is the first time that anybody has tried, and has dared, to sum up the rôle of French Freemasonry during the revolutionary period. And it is the first time that a writer belonging to the "left parties" openly describes the enormous part played in the development of the French Revolution by the secret societies and more particularly by the regular Freemason societies. M. Martin's book is



entertaining, original, quite bold, and very illuminating. I should not say that it is entirely devoid of any mistake or prejudice. The mere fact that M. Sagnac accepted the invitation to write a preface for him and that the book is dedicated to M. Arthur Mille, grand master of the French Grand Orient, shows that M. Martin did not mean to say anything which could hurt French Freemasons. The author has his prejudices, but if one remembers that his book has been written under the influence of French Freemasonry one is struck by his great fairness. For the first time this author analyzes very openly and clearly the great and essential work done by French and Continental Freemasonry in preparing a revolution in France. It explains many mysterious and puzzling facts of these years 1788-1799. The documents collected by M. Martin are many and exceedingly important. With Mathiez's books and a few pages of Cochin this volume is the only one, it seems, which has added anything original to our knowledge of the French Revolution since Taine wrote his *Ancien Régime*. No scholar can afford to ignore it, although one may have to disagree with it.

*Le Cardinal Collier et Marie Antoinette.* Par J. Munier-Jolain. (Paris, Payot, 1927, pp. 263, 25 fr.) A work of vulgarization, the product of the leisure of an *avocat*, treating a serious subject with a light and entertaining touch. It is a new edition of an old work that dealt with the life of "that evil personality", the Cardinal de Rohan, "who, for ten years, at least, prepared untiringly the end of Marie-Antoinette. The *procès du collier* is no more than an incident in this struggle, which began at Vienna in the presence of Marie-Thérèse and was continued in Paris and Versailles. Everything is connected, everything hangs together . . . up to the decree of 1786, up to the scaffold". The original work was not simply a treatment of "the affair of the collar"—only a few pages are devoted to that notorious affair—but a brief, entertaining sketch—about a hundred pages—of the life of the cardinal. This sketch—the second part of the new edition—is preceded by a biographical study of the Abbé Georgel, *l'âme damnée du cardinal*, from whose *Mémoires* a large part of the source-material is drawn, and is followed by sixty pages of extracts from the *Mémoires*. The justification of this superfluous third part, according to the author, is the rarity (!) of the *Mémoires*. To complete the description of the volume, it should be said that it also contains a preface of eight pages by the *bâtonnier*, M<sup>e</sup> Henri-Robert, of the Académie Française, describing the "physionomie tranchée" of his friend the author, and an "aperçu bibliographique, coup d'oeil d'ensemble sur les sources", by M. J. Munier-Jolain, well named an "aperçu". We all recognize the genre: such goods may be suited to domestic consumption, but they should not be exported. There is however one thing that the scholar may gain from a rapid reading of this volume and that is the possibilities of the subject either as the matter for a series of monographs, based on serious research—such as the career of the cardinal as

ambassador at Vienna—or for a *magnum opus*, dealing with the drama that began at Vienna and ended, for Marie-Antoinette, on the scaffold.

FRED MORROW FLING.

*La Révolution Française.* Par Albert Mathiez, Chargé du Cours d'Histoire de la Révolution Française à l'Université de Paris. Tome III., *La Terreur*. (Paris, Armand Colin, 1927, pp. 224, 9 fr.) "En Robespierre ils avaient tué, pour un siècle, la République démocratique. . . . Robespierre, Couthon, Saint-Just . . . n'auraient pu réussir que s'ils avaient possédé à eux seuls toute la dictature" (p. 223). Robespierre hesitated and when he thought it too late to assert his power he shot himself, and was guillotined the next day, July 28, 1794.

The criticism of volumes I. and II. (this journal, XXVIII. 356-357; XXX. 641-642) and of *Autour de Robespierre* (XXXI. 169-170, reviewed by Professor Fling) as to the high merits of Professor Mathiez's books is applicable to the third volume. Mathiez is a "Robespierriste". But it seems to me that he has restrained his sympathies and antipathies more in this volume than in some of his previous publications. There are comparatively few statements like the one quoted with the inference that Robespierre had it in his power to establish a democratic republic and that he might have done so by the creation of a triumvirate.

Mathiez has drawn heavily on the manuscript material. He had the advantage, as successor of Aulard, of having at his disposal the vast amount of original material that has been either printed or at least properly filed and listed during the last generation. And hundreds of detailed studies have been made of the Revolution concerning both individual men and local communities. Also because of the many achievements in the whole field of social studies in recent years Mathiez was enabled to view his subject in a broader light. His problem is similar to that of Robespierre. It is in part a problem in social psychology, in human behavior. France was in the throes of war, social readjustment and disintegration. Human passions dominated and made people absurd and irresponsible. Men professed one thing and did the other. They were at a loss what to do. A clever speech made them turn from one extreme to the other. The conservatives at times shouted louder for extreme measures than the "ultras". The best and the worst impulses were in mortal combat, and often in the same human breast. There was need for enthroning a Parisian maiden Goddess of Reason in order to escape from, or at least to soften, emotional fanaticism. Robespierre was so often deceived that he held himself aloof. He trusted very few. He was sadly misunderstood. He believed in the policy of terror to the last so that all opposition to the government should end.

This is a good book, the best perhaps so far written on this chapter of the Revolution. It is my candid opinion however that Mathiez has succeeded only in a measure, if at all, better than Robespierre in solving the riddle of the Reign of Terror.

CARL CHRISTOL.

*Souvenirs du Mameluck Ali sur l'Empereur Napoléon.* Par Louis-Étienne Saint-Denis, avec une introduction de G. Michaut, Professeur à la Sorbonne. (Paris, Payot, 1926, pp. 320, 30 fr.) Though there appears on the reverse of the title-page the legend, "Premier tirage août 1926", this work first appeared in an English translation by F. H. Potter in New York in 1922 and in London in 1923. The introduction (pp. 7-20) is furnished by G. Michaut, professor of French eloquence at the Sorbonne, who is the husband of a great-granddaughter of the writer of the souvenirs. Louis-Étienne Saint-Denis, 1788-1856, entered the imperial service in 1806 and became the Emperor's body-servant as second mameluke in December, 1811, in which capacity he attended Napoleon, except for brief intervals, until his death at St. Helena in May, 1821. The intervals mentioned correspond to breaks in the narrative down to page 117, which are bridged by editorial memoranda, though there is no indication whether these gaps represent *lacunae* in the manuscript.

In the absence of a table of contents, a brief analysis is desirable to indicate the nature and extent of the materials presented. An interesting picture of life in the Tuileries (pp. 23-33) is followed by experiences in the Russian campaign (pp. 33-53) but the year 1813 is a blank. Though Saint-Denis was not with the Emperor at the first abdication, he reports on the authority of a fellow servant, Hubert, without any question, the attempt at suicide (pp. 54-58). The sojourn at Elba (pp. 58-83), the return from Elba to Paris (pp. 83-105), the campaign of Waterloo (pp. 105-117), the mysterious journey from Malmaison to the *Bellerophon* (pp. 117-132), and the voyage to St. Helena (pp. 132-142) are rich in intimate details of the most lively interest. The lonely years of exile (pp. 142-258), the final illness (pp. 258-281), the obsequies (pp. 281-297), and the departure of the personal suite from the island are described with precision and almost judicial temper. It was reserved for Saint-Denis to revisit St. Helena in 1840 and to accompany the remains of the Emperor to their final resting-place on the banks of the Seine.

Apparently Saint-Denis did not undertake to write down his recollections until after 1826 and had not ceased to labor on them until his death thirty years later. There are indications of his familiarity with the St. Helena literature produced by the other companions of the exile, which had practically all been published some years before his death, though his account seems quite independent therefrom. Absolute but not adulatory loyalty to the Emperor, equable and disciplined disposition, charitable spirit, well-poised mind, clear memory, conscientious accuracy, and power of simple lucid expression mark Saint-Denis and impart charm to his narrative which will hold a deserved place among the records of Napoleon's years of misfortune.

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER.

*La Vie Économique de la France sous la Monarchie Censitaire, 1815-1848.* Par Henri Sée, Professeur Honoraire à l'Université de Rennes.

(Paris, Alcan, 1927, pp. 191, 20 fr.) The purpose of this small volume of 182 pages is to summarize the information that has been so far discovered in regard to the economic life of France between the years 1815-1848, and to turn the attention of scholars to a field that is, for the most part, open and unexplored. These, in themselves, are worthy motives, but Professor Sée has gone further than this; he has given us a work that has been sorely needed by all those who are concerned with the history of early nineteenth-century France. In a remarkably compressed space, he has presented a very lucid and entertaining survey of the condition of affairs during the early period of the Restoration, and treated of the progress that was made in later years.

The book is about equally divided into five parts. Chapter I. deals with the history of agriculture, which occupation continued to be the principal economic activity of France after the fall of the empire. The conditions of the land-holding classes are carefully analyzed and the primitive methods that were still in use are described. It was not until the year 1840 that real progress in this field commenced, when the attempts of the government in 1831, 1832, and 1836 to encourage the development of agricultural pursuits began to have an effect. Another factor was the growth, after 1840, of means of communication through the establishment of the *chemins vicinaux*. Chapter II. treats briefly of the industrial development and the introduction of machinery. As in the case of agriculture, industry was slow in developing during the Restoration, and it was only with the July Monarchy, supported as it was by the capitalist interests, that real progress began. This development led in turn to the decadence of rural industry and the very gradual concentration of manufacturing into certain specified areas. Slow as this movement was, even under Louis Philippe, its attendant problems arose in France just as they had previously arisen in England. The social problem, with its questions of wages, life, and condition of laborers, and a government at first reluctant to intervene and to institute a programme of reform, appeared. The situation of the French laborer was rendered more difficult by the practice of the *livret* and the laws that forbade laborers' associations. This situation and the efforts that were made through mutual societies and *sociétés de résistance* form the subject of chapters III. and IV., that conclude with Professor Sée's estimate of the part played by the labor problems in the Revolution of 1848. In his opinion the economic crises of 1847 and 1848 were profound factors in the political troubles that ensued, even though the working classes had as yet no national party of their own. The discussion concludes with a chapter on trade and the growth of maritime commerce. At the end of the volume Professor Sée has added an excellent bibliography.

J. M. S. A.

*A History of Europe, 1871-1920.* By D. B. Horn, M.A., Assistant in History in the University of Edinburgh. (London, John Murray, 1927,

pp. xvi, 254, 4 s. 6 d.) This small volume is intended as a continuation of Sir Richard Lodge's *Student's Modern Europe*, which stopped at 1878. It has some marked excellences—clear and careful statement, accuracy in nearly all matters, studious moderation, fairness, absence of chauvinism, and intelligent appreciation of diplomatic and military situations and moves. A fair sense of proportion is in general manifested, though an American eye will observe that the military participation of the United States in the World War is accorded six brief and scattered sentences, less than is given to the Sykes-Picot Agreement or the siege of Kut. The narrative is rigidly confined to political and military events. The history of Europe is treated as primarily the history of diplomatic manoeuvres and their results. Of economic and social developments in Europe in these fifty years the student is given no notion. Within its own chosen field, on the other hand, the book imparts information to excess. No man could mention more facts or events of European history in eighty thousand words than Mr. Horn has done. It is to be feared that he has written with his eye chiefly on his fellow-historians, lest they find his book incomplete, rather than on his students and readers, of whom only the most eager and robust will find pleasure in it.

The reviewer is moved to comment on the statement that "American school history books kept alive the old prejudices against Britain", a "hardy perennial" statement one meets often in British publications. Is not this a myth? Can anyone name a text-book, largely used in American schools in the last thirty years, that does this? The reviewer believes that he has not seen one.

*Southern Albania or Northern Epirus in European International Affairs, 1912-1923.* By Edith Pierpont Stickney. (Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, 1926, pp. xi, 195, \$2.50.) One of the surprises of the post-war period has been the retention by Albania of practically the entire territory assigned to that new state in 1913, together with the preservation of her autonomy, comparatively free (unless it be during recent months) from foreign control. The cross-currents of territorial greed, nationalistic ambition, and diplomatic intrigue in the midst of which this result was achieved take their origin from all the governments of Europe. Their charting and evaluation is a vast and difficult task which might be well worth accomplishing.

The essay of Miss Stickney does not attempt the whole of such a process. Except for general statements, particularly in the introductory chapters, she confines her attention to southern Albania, as its fortunes were involved in the military and diplomatic struggles of the Balkan wars and the Great War and their settlements. A surprising amount of material has been found and examined thoroughly by her. She was able to make use of the Hoover War Library at Stanford University, which contains some manuscripts, many public documents, and a considerable amount of "delegation propaganda". Publications of societies, peri-

odical articles, the principal newspapers of several countries, and a group of secondary books have also been laid under contribution.

The tone of the inquiry is eminently fair and free from bias. It might be argued that the use of the phrase "Southern Albania" before "Northern Epirus" implies a preference for Albanians over Greeks. But no trace of such a preference is visible in the summaries of arguments advanced for and against the two sides in the controversy. Evidently the order of the phrases rests merely upon the fact that the district in question remains at present politically a part of Albania.

The style of the book is clear and remarkably free from errors of all descriptions. The well-stated discussions are summarized at the end of the chapters, and the whole is restated in the concluding chapter. An appendix contains certain portions of the report of the Peace Conference Committee on Greek Territorial Claims, together with several annexes.

A. H. LYBYER.

*Sources for the History of British India in the Seventeenth Century.* By Shafaat Ahmad Khan, Litt.D., F.R.Hist.S., University Professor of Modern Indian History, Allahabad. [Allahabad University Studies in History, volume IV.] (London, Oxford University Press, 1926, pp. viii, 395, 25 s.) In India, as in all countries, historical writing has been inspired largely by other motives than disinterested curiosity and love of truth, but there, as elsewhere, the gospel of Ranke claims its converts, and promising foundations have been laid for a native school of scientific history. At the University of Allahabad Professor Shafaat Ahmad Khan has for some years been training his students in the most austere methods of historical research, and the high quality of the volumes that have been published under his editorship in the Allahabad University Studies in History show that his efforts have been attended with no little success. "Do not write a line of history until you have mastered all the material on the subject and freed your mind from all prejudices, be they prejudices of theory or prejudices of race or religion." This is the maxim of what the professor calls with pardonable pride "the Allahabad School", and this is the lofty ideal that he has held before himself in his own historical work. His specialty is the history of early English interests and activities in India, in which field his reputation as an authority was established by monographs on East India trade in the seventeenth century and Anglo-Portuguese negotiations relating to Bombay.

The present volume is the product of many years' labor in examining the materials for early Anglo-Indian history to be found in English and Indian record offices and libraries. Of the nine sections into which it is divided eight deal with the records in English depositories and one with those in the record offices of India. In England the author made an exhaustive search in the manuscript collections of the British Museum, the Public Record Office, the India Office Library and Record Department,

AM HIST REV, VOL. XXXIII.—13.



the Bodleian Library, All Souls College, the Library of the London Guildhall, the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth Palace, and in Privy Council Registers. His examination of documents in India was less thorough. What he presents is no mere catalogue, but a descriptive and critical survey of sources, which will prove indispensable to students of any phase of Anglo-Indian history in the seventeenth century. The author deserves all praise for the fine enthusiasm that inspired his labors and sustained him in them. "Every important document", he tells us, "has been subjected to a close and careful scrutiny, and references have been given to printed works that throw further light on the matter." The value of the compilation is enhanced by an excellent index.

R. L. SCHUYLER.

*Das Zaristische Russland im Weltkriege.* Herausgegeben von der Zentralstelle für Erforschung der Kriegsursachen. (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1927, pp. lix, 337.) This interesting volume is a German translation of some five hundred secret letters and telegrams from the Russian archives, extending from July 25, 1914, to July 28, 1916. They are grouped to illustrate Russian policy during the war toward Turkey, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Italy, and throw a great deal of light on the selfish motives which finally determined each of these states to participate in the general conflict—as is pointed out in M. Pokrovski's excellent and amusingly ironical introduction, which is also here translated. Russia's policy toward Greece during the war is not included, because the documents on this have been edited fully in a Russian volume by Professor Adamov, *European Powers and Greece during the World War* (Moscow, 1922).

A considerable number of the documents here printed have also appeared in Russian in two other excellent collections edited by Professor Adamov, *The Partition of Asiatic Turkey* (1924), and *Constantinople and the Straits* (2 vols., 1925-1926); and some of them have already been translated into German in Stieve's *Iswolski im Weltkriege, 1914-1917* (1925), and *Das Russische Orangebuch über den Kriegsausbruch mit der Türkei* (1926), and into Italian in greatly abbreviated form in *L'Intervento dell'Italia nei Documenti Segreti dell'Intesa* (1923). In this connection one may add a corrigendum to Professor Barnes's reference in *Current History* for August, 1927 (p. 677), to "an eighteen-volume collection of Russian documents (with many more in preparation) known as the *Red Archives*, issued in Russian since 1922 under the editorship of Professor E. A. Adamov". *Krasnyi Arkhiv*, or *Red Archives*, is not a "collection of documents" like the other collection to which he refers on the same page, or like those of Professor Adamov which I have mentioned above. Though *Krasnyi Arkhiv* gives great space to the publication of documents, it is otherwise, as its subtitle indicates, an "Historical Journal" of the usual type, containing articles, book reviews, personal notes, etc., chiefly on Russian history during the past century and with a

special eye to the development of socialistic and revolutionary movements. The nineteen numbers hitherto issued are excellently edited by M. Pokrovski and several associates, of whom Professor Adamov is not one.

Though no attempt can here be made even briefly to summarize the kaleidoscopic territorial offers and combinations by which Russia and the Entente tried to bribe these four lesser powers to remain neutral or to join their side of the struggle, one is struck by the extraordinary cynicism and selfishness which characterized the bargaining on both sides. If we had the parallel documents from the German side we should doubtless find very much the same sort of thing. In contrast to the documents on the period prior to the outbreak of the war, in which one finds most of the responsible statesmen honestly expressing a desire to prevent war, if possible without too great sacrifice of prestige and interests, these telegrams, sent when Europe was already plunged in the life and death struggle, betray little evidence of such laudable desires.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

*The Papers of Sir William Johnson.* Prepared for publication by the Division of Archives and History, Alexander C. Flick, Ph.D., Litt.D., Director and State Historian. Volume V. (Albany, University of the State of New York, 1927, pp. x, 855.) The earlier volumes of the published series of the *Papers of Sir William Johnson*, which is being undertaken by the State of New York, were reviewed in this journal in the issues of July, 1923 (XXVIII. 758-760), and April, 1926 (XXXI. 584-585). The present volume, like its immediate predecessor, again illustrates the deplorable loss to historical scholarship resulting from the New York Capitol fire of 1911. Dr. Flick was able to print but a few more than 400 papers for the years 1766 and 1767 out of the nearly 1000 items listed in the *Calendar of Sir William Johnson Manuscripts* (Albany, 1909), and of this number 364 were more or less damaged by fire. In fact very few papers of the original Johnson Collection appear here in undamaged form. They are supplemented by about 130 documents drawn from other manuscript repositories, notably the Library of Congress, the Public Record Office in London, and the Harvard College Library. The volume also contains, in chronological sequence, abstracts of missing papers as noted in the *Calendar*.

The central figure in all the transactions referred to in the volume is, of course, Sir William Johnson. The bulk of the papers consists of letters to and from General Thomas Gage, commander-in-chief of the British forces in North America, Lord Shelburne and the Board of Trade, the governors of the northern and middle colonies, Johnson's subordinates in the Indian Department, church officials, merchants, and personal friends. The dominant theme of the collection is Indian politics. The complexities of Indian and colonial relations—involving trade, land grants, the Indian boundary line, encroachments of white settlers on Indian lands, wars and rumors of wars, and the delicate issue of treaty

negotiations—are well illustrated. There are many illuminating documents, particularly in the correspondence between Johnson and Governor Carleton of Canada, wherein the latter attempts to absolve the French Canadians of complicity in Indian conspiracies. Papers relating to western colonial schemes also appear, although much of this material had been printed elsewhere. To the reviewer the most suggestive portion of the volume concerns the efforts of Johnson and certain prominent Anglicans in the colonies to formulate a programme for the establishment of mission schools and churches on the Indian frontier. A plan similar to that used by the Jesuits in America was urged by Johnson. The establishment of an Anglican episcopate is also strongly and frequently recommended as an appropriate means of launching the mission enterprise.

Scholars are under a heavy obligation to the Historical Department of New York for the publication of this remnant, the salvaging of which has taken years of patient labor. The only defect in the work is the omission of an index and a calendar of the documents printed. It is assumed that the concluding volume of the series will contain a general index of the whole.

C. E. CARTER.

*The Negro in our History.* By Carter Godwin Woodson, Ph.D., Editor of the *Journal of Negro History*. Fourth edition. (Washington, Associated Publishers, 1927, pp. xxx, 616, \$3.25.) This book is an enlargement of one of the same title published in 1922. It is a record of negro achievement, with special reference to the United States, and covers such subjects as slavery, the civil war, reconstruction, achievements of freedom in literature, art, business, and the professions, the negro in the World War, social justice, etc. It is copiously illustrated.

From the standpoint of condensed information on a variety of aspects of negro achievement, the book is highly valuable, but displays a bias in favor of the radical type of negroes in discussing all racial questions. For example, it characterizes as "dishonorable" Roosevelt's action in reference to the negro soldiers implicated in the shooting-up of Brownsville in 1906. It interprets Taft's policy respecting the negro as the "accentuation of caste". It minimizes and misrepresents the work and policies of Booker Washington, and takes sides with the Trotter-Du-Bois faction which denounced Washington as "a traitor to his people", because he did not participate conspicuously in political agitations.

Conspicuous participation in politics by the head of an institution of learning generally impairs his influence as an educator, and in most institutions is not tolerated. Yet because Booker Washington did not take the stump, and fall in with the most radical negro political agitators, he was branded as "a traitor". And, as if that were not enough, the radicals attempted to represent him as opposed to the higher education of his race. For instance, the author of this book, by innuendo, says that Washington "did not openly attack higher education".

JEROME DOWD.

*The Story of Civil Liberty in the United States.* By Leon Whipple. (New York, Vanguard Press, 1927, pp. x, 366, \$.50.) In this little volume Mr. Whipple tells, not the story of the winning, but of the violations, of civil liberty in America. Fortified by abundant references to sources and authoritative studies, the book brings into one narrative the acts of mobs, local police, state officials, and federal authorities, by which individuals and minority groups have been deprived of the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, the right of trial by jury, the freedom of speech or press, the right of peaceable assembly, and other rights and privileges traditionally regarded as fundamental. It demonstrates that we have "too complacently accepted our liberty as an inheritance, won by our forefathers" (p. 327).

The book is propaganda of the better kind. On the whole it is dispassionately and fairly written. In discussing the Censorship of Morals, the author remarks that "as usual it has proved extremely difficult to preserve useful freedoms while punishing deliberate vice" (p. 284). Elsewhere he seems sometimes to lose sight of this truth, as in the account of the extradition of McNamara (pp. 231-233), which might usefully be compared with Vice-President Thomas R. Marshall's statement (*Recollections*, pp. 200-206). Nor does he aid the reader by discriminating comment upon the incidents related, which range from the barbarities of irresponsible mobs to those possibly pardonable stretches of power necessitated by the exigencies of war.

Brevity precludes extended comment, to be sure, and it is no part of the writer's task to pose as judge of the creed of Loyalist, Mormon, Abolitionist, or I. W. W. He is concerned with the right of every man, whether criminal, fanatic, or prophet, to a hearing and fair treatment. "Some day", he hopes, "men will realize that it is not a mere phrase—that highest ideal of liberty—to be willing to die that other men may have the right to teach what you believe to be false and dangerous" (p. 329).

Mr. Whipple's most penetrating comment is that what is really needed is not a change in the Constitution so much as "in the spirit of the people" (p. 328). As information is the first step in the education of the public mind and conscience, he has performed a useful task in assembling the facts presented in this volume. If they leave some readers bewildered and dejected, let us hope that they will quicken many to ask, "What must we do to be saved?"

HOMER C. HOCKETT.

*The Diplomatic and Commercial Relations of the United States and Chile, 1820-1914.* By William Roderick Sherman, Ph.D. (Boston, R. G. Badger, 1926, pp. 224, \$3.00.) The field chosen by the author of this book has received little previous attention. Another merit which it possesses to a notable degree is that of having been based largely upon official documents—unpublished manuscripts in the archives of the Department

of State, for the period prior to 1861, and, subsequently, correspondence printed in the department's annual publication, *Foreign Relations*. The volume indicates that the diplomatic intercourse between the two countries has consisted chiefly of the discussion of claims of citizens of the United States against the government of Chile. More numerous and extensive textual quotations from the documents would have enhanced the interest and value of the book.

A bibliography cites many books and periodicals which might have been, but of which (judging from the citations of sources) apparently only a few were, extensively used. The citations are between parentheses in the body of the page instead of in foot-notes. Other departures from the customary style of scholarly historical composition are observable. Inexact expressions, crude constructions, and incorrect sentences, especially in the first two chapters, are too numerous to specify. There is no index; and the table of contents contains only chapter headings. At the beginning of each chapter there is, however, a brief summary, but without page citations, of the principal subtopics treated.

The statement, "an army occupied Tacna and Arica, cutting off Balmaceda's revenue from the nitrate fields there" (p. 145), voices, without undertaking to remove it, the popular fallacy that nitrate is produced in the disputed provinces. The words "and Commercial" in the title appear to have been an after-thought, being practically unsupported in the text except by a few brief statistical paragraphs added at the close of each of the last two chapters.

In spite of its shortcomings the little volume is useful both in itself and, chiefly perhaps, as a guide to subjects for more extensive studies of brief periods or episodes upon which many monographs will need to be produced before a final, or really scholarly, history of the diplomatic relations between the two countries can be written. An appendix of four pages contains two very useful tables, the first of the names of United States representatives in Chile and the other of Chilean representatives in the United States with the rank and period of service of each.

W. R. M.

*Chile and its Relations with the United States.* By Henry Clay Evans, jr., Ph.D., Professor of History in the University of Florida. (Durham, Duke University Press, 1927, pp. xii, 243, \$2.50.) The author gives us, within moderate compass, more than his title promises. He not only presents a clear and concise interpretation of diplomatic relations between the two countries but summarizes salient points in the political development of Chile. Not all his summarized descriptions bear directly on the diplomacy of the moment. They do not clog the narrative, however, and in view of the paucity of accounts of Chile in English, we welcome this additional offering. The recent Tacna-Arica fiasco makes the main topic especially timely.

Professor Evans expresses himself well, without evident bias. The Chilean authors that he freely uses are, it is true, distinctly partizan, both as regards their local opponents and as regards the foreigner; but he employs them, as well as contemporary travellers, to balance a narrative that otherwise rests largely on the printed and manuscript records of the Department of State. His index is adequate; his bibliography impressive and thoroughly utilized. The volume has an attractive format. The press-work on the whole is excellent. There are a few typographical slips (*e.g.*, "now", p. 101, note 6; "naiton", p. 216; "allaged", p. 220; "Combiadas", p. 223; "Cinfuentes", pp. 17, 224; "Luís", pp. 188, 194) and some minor errors in dates (*e.g.*, pp. 43, 162, 170, 188). Prieto was inaugurated in 1831, not in 1833 (p. 43); William Walker was executed in Honduras and not in Nicaragua (p. 78); Agustín Edwards was the Chilean representative at Arica and not *minister* (p. 218, note) and he returned there later last year for the mournful finale. *El Ferrocarril* (p. 232) suspended publication some twenty years ago, and began long before 1889.

The story as presented, with scholarly faithfulness, is not one for un-mixed pride. Too much of our relationship with Chile has concerned itself with personal and pecuniary claims, with commercial details, and with well-meant but unfruitful attempts at mediation or arbitration. Such questions do not tend to create international solidarity. Professor Evans makes this all too evident, but no one can read his well-balanced account without coming to the conclusion that the fault does not lie wholly on one side.

I. J. C.

*James Buchanan and his Cabinet on the Eve of Secession.* By Philip Gerald Auchampaugh, Ph.D., Professor of History, State Teacher's College, Duluth, Minnesota. (Privately printed, 1926, pp. ix, 224, \$2.40.) In this doctoral thesis presented to Syracuse University, Dr. Auchampaugh gives a eulogistic interpretation of the course pursued by Buchanan's administration from Lincoln's election to his inauguration. In an effort to shake off the impressions of those "arm-chair generals", the historians, and to get back to the "yesterday afternoon of our history" before the days of capitalistic nationalism, the author goes over the record for the purpose of clearing Buchanan's name of the insinuations that have been cast upon it. Two prefatory chapters are devoted to a recapitulation of Buchanan's career and a defense of his Kansas policy. His support of the Lecompton constitution for the sake of the Union is set over against the "hypocrisy" of the Republicans who would have kept Kansas bleeding for party purposes. The bulk of the book consists of a rather elaborate study of Buchanan's ministers and a sympathetic treatment of the crushing difficulties which beset the President during the secession crisis. As to the steering of the ship of state during these harassing months, Dr. Auchampaugh's main conclusions are that the President was



master in his own house; that he made few mistakes; that, being one of the ablest of the lawyer-presidents, his whole career had been spent in trying to substitute arbitration for the sword; that the determination to avoid aggression and to prevent war constituted the keynote of his policy; that he sincerely believed the government had no power to coerce a state but was equally clear that it should defend itself, and was therefore unyielding as to the evacuation of the forts; that he had great faith in the proposal for a general convention and relied much upon the curative effect of time; that he labored tirelessly for compromise, and that he achieved much by keeping the Northern members in his Cabinet save one, avoiding a recognition of the seceded states, holding some of the Federal "property" in the South, and averting the disaster that came later when "coercion" was attempted. The book shows us that a re-examination of Buchanan's administration is desirable. Unfortunately, the bibliography is very badly punctuated and full of errors; and the volume is further marred by misspelling and by occasional excess in the use of epithets.

J. G. RANDALL.

*The Austin Papers.* Edited by Eugene C. Barker. Volume III., October, 1834-January, 1837. (Austin, University of Texas, 1927, pp. xxxv, 494, \$4.00.) This is the third and final volume of the Austin Papers. The first volume was published in two parts in 1924 by the American Historical Association as a part of the *Annual Report* for 1919, and the second will be published by that association at some future time. It is unfortunate that the third volume could not have been brought out by the association also so that the entire work could have appeared in a single series. But, as Professor Barker explains in the preface, the generosity of the association could not be extended to more than 3000 pages. The third volume is therefore published by the University of Texas press. It conforms however very closely to the format and style of binding of the report of the association, so that it will not seem out of place if one puts it on the shelves of his library along with that report.

The period covered by this volume extends from October, 1834, to February, 1837, during which time Texas established her independence. We therefore take up the book to find out primarily what documentary evidence it may contain concerning Austin's connection with that movement. As we read along we discover that we are able to trace in broad outline, and sometimes to fill in with considerable detail, his attitude towards the Texas Revolution and his part in it. At first he did not favor independence: on the contrary we find him renewing his oft-repeated declaration of loyalty and fidelity to Mexico. But he was stoutly opposed to the proposed changes in the constitution of Mexico, because they would transform the government from a federal to a highly centralized system and as a result prevent Texas from attaining to the status of statehood in the Mexican Republic. He therefore urged the people of Texas to protest in the strongest terms possible against any change being

made, and called upon them to resist by force of arms any military invasion of Texas by Mexico. Even after war broke out he continued to advise against a declaration of independence and did not commit himself in favor of it until December, 1835.

The documents pertaining to Austin's diplomatic mission to the United States in the first half of 1836 to obtain financial assistance and to sound the government on the questions of recognition and annexation, and those concerning the proposal to send Santa Anna after his capture at San Antonio to Washington to get the government to intercede between Texas and Mexico, are intensely interesting and illuminating. Other personal affairs, such as Austin's defeat for the presidency of the Republic of Texas, his appointment as secretary of state, his strained relations with his old-time friend, Sam M. Williams, his broken health and his yearning to retire from public life, are set forth in the closing documents of the volume.

There is much else in the volume besides the matter bearing upon the life of Austin that can be utilized by students who are interested in conditions in Texas, Mexico, and the United States during the revolution.

The editor has made very sparing use of foot-notes in both the first and the third volumes. It has been his intention to let the documents tell their own story without much explanation or amplification on his part, but this method of procedure sometimes leaves the reader somewhat in the dark as to certain matters, especially the identity of many of the persons named. The calendar in this volume is an improvement over the one in the first, in that it appears as a table of contents after the preface and contains page-references after the entries, thus enabling the reader to find more easily the documents he may wish to consult. In the preface the date of Austin's release from imprisonment in Mexico is given as December 25, 1835, instead of 1834. This is undoubtedly a typographical error, but oddly enough it is repeated a second time in the same paragraph.

E. M. VIOLETTE.

*The Bridge to France.* By Edward N. Hurley. (Philadelphia and London, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1927, pp. xiv, 338, \$5.00.) Here is another of the personal narratives of the civilian coadjutors who made possible the mobilization of American economic resources for the war of 1917. The stories that all of them tell are much the same: a hurried start on an inadequate legislative base; a scramble for personnel, material, and working plans for the use of both; gigantic schemes conceived as though each stood alone as the supreme American effort; heroic and self-denying labors; and an armistice that came too soon to permit a display of things accomplished.

Mr. Hurley does not tell the half of the story of the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and he writes the language of the conscious advocate of his own work; but he tells enough to meet the need of any but the most technical student of the World War. His account

of the organization, programme, and attainments of the shipping authorities follows conventional lines. It is written with good humor, and an occasional personal touch. We learn the interesting fact that George Cohan, the playwright, had a grandfather named Dennis Costigan (p. 89); and that after General George W. Goethals had been translated to Purchase, Storage, and Traffic, and still remained critical of the Shipping Board, Mr. Denman could silence him by threatening to name one of the innumerable small wood ships *The General Goethals* (p. 55). We get less than we might of the inherent problems of raw material, housing, plants, and labor; but there is space for gossip on Hurley's relations with the great four of his playmates, Edison, Ford, Burroughs, and Firestone.

At one or two places the narrative adds to or brings into relief facts of considerable importance. The opening chapters give a new view of the emergence of Woodrow Wilson, and his journey from Princeton through Trenton to the White House. There is correspondence involving John Maynard Harlan, Senator James Smith, jr., Roger Sullivan, and others who had a hand in making a President of the United States. Mr. Hurley is one of those who have retained faith in Woodrow Wilson.

The most interesting material has to do with one of the things that never happened. There is a good analysis of the efforts whereby the troop movement to France in 1918 was made possible. This is followed by evidence to show that General Pershing's eighty-division programme for 1919 must probably have broken down because of absolute shortage of ships to move the men and to bring after them the supplies for the part of the A. E. F. already overseas. Even after the allowance had been cut to thirty pounds per day per man, and after further allowance for tonnage released by deaths in France, Mr. Hurley thinks the job could not have been done.

But the war was full of impossible jobs that, one way or another, got themselves accomplished.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

*American Masters of Social Science: an Approach to the Study of the Social Sciences through a Neglected Field of Biography.* Edited by Howard W. Odum, Kenan Professor of Sociology and Director of the School of Public Welfare in the University of North Carolina. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1927, pp. viii, 411, \$4.50.) Criticizing a symposium is like appraising a five-course dinner: it is hard to remember the taste of the soup when the dessert has been eaten. The book edited by Professor Odum is really a group of ten monographs rather than a single text. For the most part the writers seem to be unaware of the other chapters in the series; and the general aim for the collection, "not biography but an approach to teaching and research in the social sciences", is hardly realized in as unified form as the statement in the preface suggests. This is to be explained in large measure by the diversity of the "masters" depicted. The reviewer's task is further compli-

cated by the marked differences in the style of presentation. It is hard to compare the seventeen-page account of Dunning by Merriam with the eighty-seven-page biography of Robinson by Barnes, or the subjective appraisal of Small by Hayes with the objective description of Ward by Dealey; and the facile, chatty style of Becker's life of Turner is of a totally different category from the precise and schematic arrangement of Homan's critique of Veblen.

The volume aims to offer an interpretation of the significance of the "masters" of social science in America for the development of "scope, content, and method" in the various disciplines represented, together with attempts to explain the influential forces in the making of the masters and of their varied contributions. History is represented by Herbert B. Adams, James Harvey Robinson, and Frederick J. Turner; economics by Thorstein Veblen; political science (sometimes combined with history after the earlier academic mode) by John W. Burgess and W. A. Dunning; and sociology by Franklin H. Giddings, Albion W. Small, and Lester F. Ward. The editor has protected himself cleverly, if somewhat dubiously, against the inevitable protests that will come from readers who find serious omissions in this list: "The initial set (*i.e.*, of masters) is offered only as a representative group suitable for the purpose and space-limitations of this book, and has been selected in accordance with what appear to be prevailing preferences in each of the several disciplines" (p. vi). Students in other fields will doubtless think of "masters" whose relation to dominant current trends is as integral as that of Cooley to psychological sociology. But a promise is held out of another volume which it is hoped will repair such deficiencies. Each of the nine leaders listed is treated in a chapter by some one personally acquainted with him, usually a former student; and an introductory summary is given by the editor. The accounts are all eulogistic, with the notable exception of the critical study of Veblen by Professor Paul T. Homan; and more of his type of measured adverse criticism would have added greatly to the value of the book.

The editorial summary offers interesting generalizations and distinctions based on the nine biographies. These men were all pioneers in social science; and the reader moves through the processes of growing specialization (often discountenanced by these same masters) and of the development of indigenous American social research which has in many respects departed far from the canons and premises of its European foster-parents.

The beginner of social science studies will be fascinated by the brave struggles of these men toward new light, but will be lost in much of the critical discussion. The novice in teaching will be encouraged to pioneer in a field full of vague promise, and to achieve the teaching influence wielded by a group whose personal dissimilarities are no little comfort. The researcher will be interested in the tracing of the growth of scientific methods in this field, in the interdependence of social sci-

ences so clearly revealed in the trends of research, and will understand better the backgrounds of the present conflict between comprehensiveness and specialization in the social sciences. All will enjoy the deeper insight into the personal bases of various differences of method and opinion among the "masters".

EDWIN E. AUBREY.

*The Relation of the State to Religious Education in Massachusetts.* By Sherman M. Smith, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History in Colgate University. (Syracuse, Syracuse University Book Store, 1926, pp. vii, 350.) No subject is understood until it is studied historically. Those concerned about the place of religion in the public schools would do well to read this careful treatment of the problem in a state distinguished for its devotion alike to religion and to education.

There are three propositions which seem inevitably true: (1) the state must assume responsibility for the education of its children; (2) religion is fundamental in education; (3) education is essentially a unified process. There is no difficulty in meeting all of these conditions in a state whose people are of one religious faith. Dr. Smith points out how this was the case among the Calvinistic people from whom the early settlers came and how naturally it was continued in Massachusetts. But when religious differences develop these three propositions are incompatible. The great value of this book is in tracing the steps by which this incompatibility became apparent.

Intelligent people to-day often insist that the public school can remain unsectarian and yet teach the great fundamentals of religion which all religious people accept. They forget that the omission of a doctrine regarded by some as fundamental may be tantamount to its denial. The Massachusetts history reveals this. The first difficulty was between the orthodox and the Unitarian. Horace Mann insisted that unsectarian teaching could be only that to which no one objected. The orthodox rightly replied that such teaching was essentially Unitarian. If they could not have the truth which they most firmly believed they would rather have none at all.

The illogical character of the unsectarian teaching was more clearly revealed when the great Irish migration made Massachusetts so largely Roman Catholic. Their position, accepting the above three propositions, was that the state should allot the taxes of each religious group to the church-education of that group. But of course this was practically for the state to abrogate its responsibility and to hand education back to the church.

The logic of modern life leads to secular public education, leaving religious education to the family and the church. The Roman Catholic must necessarily meet this with the parochial school. It is not ideal for anybody but, as this historical survey reveals, it is inevitable.

Two errors are noted: the spelling of Whitefield (p. 65); for twentieth century read nineteenth (p. 99).

THEO. G. SOARES.

*Makers of the Meadville Theological School, 1844-1894.* By Francis A. Christie. (Boston, Beacon Press, 1927, pp. iv, 171.) The Meadville Theological School, recently transplanted to Chicago from Meadville, Pennsylvania, has had a significance, quite disproportionate to its size, in the history of religious life and theological education in America, and it is this larger context in which Professor Christie has set the first fifty years of its existence. Established, like the Unitarian churches in Meadville and Trenton, New York, by persons influential in the Holland Land Grant, who had brought over liberal religious principles as part of their national inheritance, the Meadville School was for many years the only theological seminary in America, besides Harvard, where liberal theology was avowedly taught. Those who have known the school intimately, as students or friends, will be especially interested in the brief and beautifully written sketches of its teachers, from Frederic Huidekoper to Thomas Hill. Granted that in these chapters we are in a world flooded with rosy light where only saints and sages dwell, yet there is a fine delicacy of drawing which atones for the absence of shadows. Through these personal portraits, too, a reader traces the progress of a theological school, hampered by inadequate equipment and slender resources, through a period of marked changes in theological thought and the service which a minister is expected to render, discriminatingly accepting new theories and courageously venturing into novel fields of ministerial training.

To students of American church history, the chapters which deal with an attempt at co-operation between Unitarians and the Christian Connection will be of especial importance. In New England, the "Christians" run back to Abner Jones, an illiterate and pretty unprepossessing character, who abhorred sectarian divisions and theological niceties and aimed to found a church upon the Bible alone, the members of which should call themselves and be called only Christians. As Christian preachers journeyed abroad, they found elsewhere in the States and in Canada small companies of people holding similar principles but ignorant of one another's existence, most of whom were subsequently drawn together into the Christian Connection. In origin and character, these Christians were quite unlike the New England Unitarians, but there was enough similarity between the principles of the two fellowships to suggest co-operation, if not organic unity, particularly in the Central West where the Christians were much the stronger body. It was believed that the zeal of the Christians would take the chill off Unitarians and that the culture of the latter would change the chip-fire ardor of the former into a back-log blaze. Accordingly Antioch College and the Meadville Theological School were established as first steps toward the hoped-for alliance, and undoubtedly Horace Mann to lead the college and Rufus Stebbins the school were the very best selections that could have been made for the end in view. But the Unitarians were rapidly giving up their original reliance upon the Bible as exclusive teacher of revealed truth, and the Christians divining the drift of thought took fright. Consequently, attempts at co-



operation failed and the two denominations drew apart. This is the story which, as regards Meadville, Professor Christie has told with ample knowledge and arresting grace of style.

W. W. FENN.

*The Negro in the Reconstruction of Virginia.* By Alrutheus Ambush Taylor, A.M. (Washington, Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1926, pp. iv, 300, \$2.00.) It would be pleasant, if possible, to write of this book with unreserved commendation. It shows literary ability, industry, and extensive research. Perhaps it is inherent in the subject and the time dealt with that it should be partizan. Its citation of authorities indicates the spirit of the advocate and not that of the impartial historian. These consist of the official reports and documents and the often intemperate expressions of a state press during an abnormal period; the reports of churches and their organs of thought, their histories and biographies, and the books of writers, notably Englishmen, generally antagonistic to one side in the Reconstruction conflict. It narrates with transparent bias the tragic story of the projection, in the space of two years, of a recently emancipated, servile population from a condition of chattel slavery into democratic citizenship. It deals with many phases of negro participation in the consequent social, economic, and political upheaval, in which the freedmen were rather the helpless tools than the effective copartners of those who did the "re-constructing"; and it totally ignores the discussions of the subject by representative Virginian writers like Curry, Bruce, McConnell, Eckenrode, and others, whose works would seem worthy of at least some notice. Its historical inaccuracy is indicated by its designation of Robert E. Lee and John B. Baldwin as "secessionists", and it denominates the attempted imposition on the people of Virginia of a constitution, disfranchising all its white men, by a convention of alien "carpet-baggers", native "scalawags", and incompetent ex-slaves, "giving the State a democratic constitution".

The most significant event in the story of Reconstruction in Virginia was the movement, led by A. H. H. Stuart and made effective by Grant, which resulted in a separate vote on the disfranchisement clause and the defeat of the clause. The state was thus saved from many of the woes that befell the other states of the South.

It is regrettable that this book, the subject of which demanded a fair and judicial treatment, should be marred by partizanship. It offered an opportunity which has been missed; but it is correct in its ultimate deduction that "the negroes, however, cannot be charged with the mistakes in the reconstruction of the State". It is an interesting and one-sided account of what might, with restraint and philosophic consideration, have been made a valuable contribution to the discussion of a great historical subject. A controversial disquisition is not scientific history.

ARMISTEAD C. GORDON.

*Florida Plantation Records from the Papers of George Noble Jones.* Edited by Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, Ph.D., Professor of American History in the University of Michigan, and James David Glunt, A.M. [Publications of the Missouri Historical Society.] (St. Louis, the Society, 1927, pp. x, 596.) In this volume the editors have added to the sources for a better understanding of the South. The plantation brought the negro to America, formed the basis of slavery's development, and shaped the course of negro life. Until plantation records have become available the history of this section can not be fully written.

The El Destino and Chemonie plantations lay in Middle Florida and were largely devoted to cotton production. The records here printed bear dates from 1847 to 1898, more than three-fourths belonging to the ante-bellum period and only two coming after 1879. They consist of overseers' reports, plantation journals, and miscellaneous documents such as slave lists, contracts, inventories, etc.

The most valuable material, by far, is found in the overseers' reports. Here, in spelling distinctly original, is revealed plantation life from the angle of the one who lived closest to the soil, the crops, and the negro. It is a record of constant hopes for high yields, usually blasted by storm and pest; of difficulties in negro care and control; of the weakness in absentee ownership; of simple human relationships evolved in a rural world. The overseer rightly holds the centre of the stage. His was the task of making cotton—accepting nature's interference but impatient with negro and mule; on him fell the responsibility for directing the lives of human beings who were another's property; he was physician for both mule and negro, curing the colic of the one with tobacco and oak-ashes, and the dropsy, fits, or dysentery of the other with calomel, bleedings, and blisterings. His duty was to property, but sometimes the human element was stronger and a negro woman bore him children.

The journals, of necessity, are dry and monotonous—they need to be if a true picture of plantation life is given. The daily occupation of the slaves, weather conditions, sick lists, etc., run with the seasons, save, perchance, when Sam, the carpenter, leaves his "beuilding" to make a coffin "for Tirah's child", or "England" runs away "for Rascality", or Melina "delivers of a girl child".

There is an unreadable map of El Destino and an account of a visit to the plantations in 1925 which might well have been omitted, several photographs taken at the time being sufficient for any purpose served. The editing is excellent and Professor Phillips's introduction is almost as valuable as the documents themselves.

One lays down the work with a firmer conviction that violent weather, unending sickness, changing overseers, uncertain staples, and irresponsible negroes, cast in a rural world, constitute the main ingredients in the story of the South that was.

AVERY O. CRAVEN.

*The Liberal Republican Movement in Missouri, 1865-1871.* By Thomas S. Barclay, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Political Science in

the University of Missouri. (Columbia, State Historical Society of Missouri, 1926, pp. v, 288.) Dr. Barclay here presents a scholarly account of the complex currents of political life during the period when the war spirit was still at a high tension. In the course of the war the Radicals had risen to power in Missouri, in spite of Blair and the other "Claybanks", who formed the conservative wing of the Union party. This struggle in Missouri caused much anxiety to Lincoln, who tried in vain to secure harmony among the political leaders of that important border state.

Later the Missouri River counties and the city of St. Louis became the seat of the Liberal Republicans, who attracted many Democrats to their ranks through the adoption of a policy which recognized that the war was over and that the sooner all political disqualifications were done away with, the better for the economic progress of the state. But the Radicals of the northern and western counties carried to wearisome length their vindictive attitude towards ex-Confederates and Southern sympathizers. Finally, however, in 1871, with the co-operation of the Democrats, the Liberal Republicans succeeded in abolishing all political and legal discriminations caused by the war. But this new party movement eventually failed to realize the hopes of its founders. For the Democrats refused to agree to their own destruction as a distinct political power.

Throughout this book the inevitable dryness of stale politics is relieved by vivid pen-pictures of Frank P. Blair, Carl Schurz, Charles D. Drake, Gratz Brown, and other leaders. Obviously to the special student of the Mississippi Valley this history is undoubtedly of great value. And even the general student of American life may find much of interest to him in this account of Missouri during Reconstruction years, especially where interesting sidelights are given regarding the trial of President Johnson, the use of the test oath as a device for perpetuating the power of the Radicals, their manipulation of the mass of enfranchised freedmen, the "possum" patience of the Democrats, the rise of the Germans to political power, the immense influence of the press, and the final victory of the policy of peace and conciliation.

A work of this sort, in which innumerable facts must be accumulated and woven into a carefully documented whole, involves a great deal of labor and skill, and if, as here, the subject is well chosen the results are eminently worth while. But is it not a pity to publish such an elaborate treatise without an index? The biography of the young author might well have given place to the much-needed index.

MARGARET BROWN O'CONNOR.

*Francisco de Ibarra and Nueva Viscaya.* By J. Lloyd Mecham, Associate Professor of Government in the University of Texas. (Durham, Duke University Press, 1927, pp. xii, 265, \$3.50.) Mexico's colonial past is slowly being reconstructed, not by the Mexicans themselves, but by scholars in the United States. The most serious scientific endeavor in Mexico has in recent years been devoted to the study of the

pre-Columbian ages of the Maya, the "Toltec", and the Aztec. The great epoch of Spanish imperialism is neglected, perhaps in part because of the *odio español* inherited from the struggle for independence. The republican period, in Mexico as in other Spanish-American countries, has as yet scarcely emerged from the stage of impassioned polemic.

Historians of Latin America of the "California School" first approached their subject by way of Spain's former provinces in our Southwest, and found their major interests in the eighteenth century when most of these provinces were subdued. They have now gone back to colonial origins, and are studying the history and institutions of sixteenth-century Mexico. And for this we are deeply indebted to them.

Professor Mecham's monograph is a valuable contribution to the history of the *conquistadores*. It deals with that second epoch when military conquest and plunder of wealthy, semi-civilized aboriginal communities was followed by the slower, less spectacular, penetration of the miner, the rancher, and the missionary, the great triad of Spanish expansion in America. It is scarcely a biography of Francisco de Ibarra—perhaps the materials that survive are not sufficient to make possible a genuine biography. Certainly the personality of Ibarra remains vague and remote enough. We have rather a carefully documented account of the first exploration and settlement of the northwestern part of the present Mexican republic, comprised within the states of Durango, Sinaloa, Sonora, and western Chihuahua. The book begins with a slight sketch of the early years of Ibarra—he started upon his career as explorer at the age of fifteen!—followed by a survey of the geography and native tribes of the region in question. This and forty pages devoted to the antecedent conquest and organization of the province of Nueva Galicia provide the background of the story. Six chapters on the public career of Ibarra, a chapter on the economic organization of Nueva Viscaya, and a very useful bibliography complete the volume.

The story is in some respects a complicated one, and it is not always made simpler by the manner of telling it. Partaking perhaps too much at times of the nature of a bare chronicle, it is often awkward or disconnected in style in a way that makes undue demands upon the attention of the reader. There are also some seeming inconsistencies which might have been avoided by more careful writing, as in the accounts of the two *entradas* to Tópia on pages 118 and 127-129. Nevertheless the work is well done, and constitutes an important and welcome addition to our too scanty literature on sixteenth-century America. The reviewer hopes that the promise of a similar account of the founding of Nuevo León will soon be fulfilled.

On page 3 "northeastern" is a misprint for "northwestern", and by "feudalism" on page 207 the writer really means the manorial system. The "viceregal confirmation" of Ibarra's commission, quoted on page 150, although signed by the Marquis of Talces, is in fact a *provisión real* transmitted by the viceroy. It does not on the face of it reflect the opinion of the viceroy himself.

C. H. HARING.

## HISTORICAL NEWS

### AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The forty-second annual meeting of the Association will be held in Washington on December 28, 29, and 30. Headquarters will be established at the New Willard Hotel. Allied societies meeting at the same time and place will be the American Political Science Association, the American Catholic Historical Association, the History of Science Society, the Bibliographical Society of America, and, as is usual, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the Agricultural History Society. The chairman of the Association's committee of local arrangements is Mr. Fairfax Harrison of Washington, the secretary Dr. Leo F. Stock of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. The programme, prepared by a committee of which Professor Samuel F. Bemis of the George Washington University is chairman, will be in the hands of members before Thanksgiving Day. Meanwhile, since it is already substantially completed, a general outline may here be given. The effort of the committee has been, as in several previous years, to give organization to the programme by selecting definite topics for the respective sessions, general and sectional, and confining papers to the fields so chosen. Thus, there will be a general session concerned with the mutual relations of science and history, with papers by Professors Frederic J. Teggart, Frederick Barry, and Lynn Thorndike; a general session on the diplomatic history of the United States, with papers by Dr. Tyler Dennett and Professors Lawrence Hill and R. C. Clark; and, in modern European history, a general session devoted to the revolutionary and similar movements of the middle of the nineteenth century, with papers by Mr. J. P. Baxter and Professor F. J. Klingberg. The joint meeting with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association will be concerned with re-valuation of the decade preceding the Civil War; that with the Agricultural History Society, with the agricultural policy of the United States government; that with the Bibliographical Society, with problems of the reproduction of rare newspapers and of the bibliography of travel in America. Sectional meetings are planned for ancient history, medieval history, Hispanic-American history (the decline of Spain's empire in America), Slavic history (post-war problems of the lesser Slavonic countries), problems of the organization of historical research, and of governmental support of historical activity. Luncheon conferences on English history, the history of the Far East, the *Dictionary of American Biography*, and the objectives and aims of the teaching of history, are also contemplated. The presidential address of Dr. Henry Osborn Taylor, president of the American Historical Association, and of Professor William B. Munro,

president of the American Political Science Association, will be delivered in a joint session of the two societies, on the first evening. On the second evening these societies, and some of the others named above, will join in a subscription dinner, with speaking by persons of distinction.

No. 2 of the *Bulletins* of the International Committee of Historical Sciences contains much to interest the historian and the student of the organization of historical studies. There are full reports of the proceedings of the executive committee (*bureau*) in its meeting of last November 25-26 and of the committee on the International Year-Book of Historical Bibliography; summary accounts of the present organization of historical work in several countries—Bulgaria, Denmark, Hungary, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and Czechoslovakia; short bibliographies for the history of a dozen countries; and reports of half a dozen historical congresses or national conventions, such as the Rochester meeting of the American Historical Association.

#### PERSONAL

John B. Bury, regius professor of modern European history in the University of Cambridge since 1902, died on June 1 at the age of sixty-five. Earlier he had been a fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, 1885-1903, and professor of modern history in the University of Dublin 1893-1902. His most important books lay in the field of the Eastern Empire. His *History of the Later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene* appeared in 1889, and his *History of the Eastern Roman Empire from the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I. (802-867)* in 1912. Ten years later he published a more elaborate treatment of the period from Arcadius to Justinian, *History of the Later Roman Empire from 395 to 565*. He also brought out (1896-1900) an annotated edition of Gibbon, a task for which his extraordinary and varied learning fitted him as few have ever been fitted. That learning was however by no means confined to Roman and Byzantine fields, as is testified by his *History of Greece* (1900), his editions of Pindar, his *Life of St. Patrick* (1905), and his penetrating treatise on *The Idea of Progress* (1920). In his later years he was much concerned with the planning and editing of the *Cambridge Ancient History* and the *Cambridge Medieval History*, to which he made notable contributions.

Sir William Ashley, who from 1892 to 1901 was professor of economic history in Harvard University (after a few years of similar service in the University of Toronto), and in that position exercised an important influence on the development of that study in this country, died in England on July 23, at the age of sixty-seven. From 1901 to 1925 he was professor of commerce in the University of Birmingham, and during the last seven of those years vice-principal of that university. Of his writings, the most noteworthy were his *Introduction to English Economic History and Theory* (1889-1893), and *Surveys, Historical and Economic* (1900), and *The Economic Organization of England: an Outline History* (1914).



Mr. George Vernadsky, formerly a member of the Russian university faculty in Prague, has lately joined that of Yale University, in which he will assist Professor Rostovtzeff, especially in the field of Byzantine history.

Professor Edward M. Earle of Columbia University has leave of absence for the present academic year, for reasons of health.

Professor Arthur I. Andrews of the University of Maryland has recently accepted appointment as professor of history in the University of Vermont.

Professor Samuel F. Bemis of the George Washington University, receiving two years' leave of absence from that institution, goes to Europe in October to supervise an extensive enterprise of (mostly photostatic) copying for the Library of Congress, to which large means have been given for the purpose. His university work will be continued by Mr. W. S. Holt.

Dr. José Vasconcelos has been reappointed as professorial lecturer in Hispanic American history for the winter and spring quarters of 1928 in the University of Chicago.

Professor Carl R. Fish of the University of Wisconsin spends the present semester on leave of absence in Europe.

Professor Archer B. Hulbert, while retaining his connection with Colorado College as professor, resigns the headship of the department of history into the hands of Professor William C. Binkley; he will spend the second semester of the present academic year in researches in the Huntington Library and in lecturing in Pomona College.

Professor Frank A. Golder of Stanford University sailed for Russia in September, having leave of absence for the first semester, which he will spend in preparation toward a series of documentary volumes illustrative of Russian history in the most recent period.

Dr. John C. Parish has been promoted to the rank of professor in the "University of California at Los Angeles" (now the official name of the institution heretofore known as the University of California, Southern Branch).

Dr. Nathaniel W. Stephenson, formerly professor in the College of Charleston, but for the last seven years connected with Yale University and its historical enterprises, has accepted election as professor of history in the new Scripps College associated with Pomona College at Claremont, Calif.

We note also the following promotions and appointments: *University of Maine*, T. P. Terhune of Ohio State University to be assistant professor of history; *George Washington University*, L. J. Ragatz to be assistant professor of history; *University of Pittsburgh*, B. J. Hovde of Alle-

gheny College to be associate professor of history; *Ohio State University*, G. A. Washburne to be professor of history and P. A. Clyde to be assistant professor; *Miami University*, J. H. St. John to be assistant professor; *University of Michigan*, P. W. Slosson to be associate professor; *University of Minnesota*, Herbert Heaton of Queens University to be professor of economic history, T. C. Blegen of Hamline University to be associate professor of history, Miss Owen Kendall of University College, London, to be lecturer in ancient history, and Miss Faith Thompson to be assistant professor; *Hamline University*, A. S. Williamson to be assistant professor of history; *University of Iowa*, G. G. Andrews of the University of South Dakota to be associate professor; *University of South Dakota*, Leonidas Dodson to be assistant professor; *University of Texas*, M. R. Gutsch to be associate professor of English history; *Rice Institute*, F. S. Lear to be assistant professor; *University of Southern California*, F. H. Garver of the University of Montana to be professor of American history and historiography, O. D. Coy to be professor of western American history, and G. P. Hammond of the University of Arizona to be assistant professor of Latin American history.

Of the eighteen scholars to whom the Social Science Research Council has awarded fellowships for 1927-1928, the following may be noted as occupied with historical subjects: Crane Brinton, the rank and file of the Jacobin clubs; Walter L. Dorn, the public administration of Frederic II. of Prussia; Wallace K. Ferguson, studies respecting Erasmus; Leo Gershoy, studies concerning Barère; Frederick S. Rodkey, Great Britain in the Near East, 1821-1878; William Jaffe, the Industrial Revolution in France.

#### GENERAL

The Naval Historical Foundation, incorporated in March, 1926, and already including some two hundred members, records its progress and the valuable accessions made to its collections, in a small pamphlet, *The Naval Historical Foundation*, to be obtained from its secretary, Captain D. W. Knox, Navy Department.

The July number of *History* has two exceptionally interesting articles: the first part of a lecture delivered in London by Professor Charles V. Langlois of Paris, on the Teaching of History in France, as it has developed during his remembrance, and one by Mr. Walter G. Bell on the Birth of the London Rate-Payer, exhibiting the development during the seventeenth century, and especially after the Great Plague and the Great Fire, of municipal care for the interests of London householders.

Mr. A. A. Knopf announces the publication this autumn of *Law in History, and other Essays*, by Professor Edward P. Cheyney, containing the notable address which Dr. Cheyney delivered at Columbus in December, 1925, as president of the American Historical Association, and five other general papers.

The *General Economic History* of Max Weber has been included in the *Adelphia Economic Series* in a translation by Frank H. Knight (New York, Greenberg).

*Das Gesetz der Macht* is the ripened historical philosophy of the aged professor of economics and minister of commerce of the Habsburg monarchy, Friedrich Wieser, who died shortly after its appearance (Vienna, Springer, 1926, pp. xv, 562).

The University of Chicago Press has brought out *The Natural History of Revolution*, by Lyford P. Edwards.

*A History of Freemasonry*, by Harry Le Roy Haywood and James E. Craig, is from the press of John Day, New York.

We have received a *Syllabus of the History of Western Europe* (Ginn, pp. 102) by Professor Franklin C. Palm of the University of California.

In Washington last November the Robert Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government celebrated the 150th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence and the *Wealth of Nations* by a conference in which three notable papers were read: an exposition of the Spirit of '76, by Professor Carl Becker of Cornell University, imaginative in form but substantial and suggestive in content; a thoughtful discussion, by Professor J. M. Clark of Columbia University, of the environment, doctrines, and influence of Adam Smith; and a spirited description, by Professor William E. Dodd of Chicago, of the manner in which Virginia took the road to revolution.

*Kingship*, by A. M. Hocart (Oxford University Press, pp. x, 250), is an inquiry into the nature of kingship, its origin, and its attendant traits, based on prolonged anthropological studies.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Jean Rutkowski, *Le Problème de la Synthèse dans l'Histoire Économique* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, XLIII.); Max Hoffinger, *Phasenwechsel in der Politik* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, V. 5); Quirino Majorana, *Alessandro Volta e l'Evoluzione della Scienza Elettrica* (Rassegna Italiana, May); C. H. Grattan, *The Historians Cut Loose* [the writer, easily wise in 1927, is shocked to find that in war time American historians succumbed to some extent—less we think than the members of any other profession—to the influence of the current prepossessions of the hour] (American Mercury, August).

#### ANCIENT HISTORY

General review: Maurice Besnier, *Chronique d'Histoire Ancienne Grecque et Romaine; l'Année 1926* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July).

*Our Early Ancestors: an Introductory Study of Mesolithic, Neolithic, and Copper Age Cultures in Europe and Adjacent Regions*, by M. C. Burkitt, is published by Macmillan.

An account of the discoveries recently made at Ur of the Chaldees by C. L. Woolley is given by Sir Ernest Budge in *The Book of the Cave of Treasures* (London, Religious Tract Society); the book will also contain a translation of a Syriac manuscript of the sixth century.

To the first volume of his important *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, which dealt with genealogy and mythography, Felix Jacoby has added a second double volume, the first part of which (A) is concerned with universal and Hellenic history, the second (C) with commentary (Berlin, Weidmann, pp. ix, 507, 340). Vol. II B., containing a concordance-list of the fragments here given with those of the older Müller edition, is now in press.

In the *Transactions* of the American Philological Association, vol. LVII., Professor David M. Robinson treats of Greek and Latin Inscriptions from Asia Minor, 76 in number, mostly mortuary, discovered and noted by him in 1924. Photographs of most of them are presented.

*The Growth of Criminal Law in Ancient Greece*, by George M. Calhoun, is published by the University of California Press. Meanwhile the University of Chicago Press has brought out *Lawyers and Litigants in Ancient Athens: the Genesis of the Legal Profession*, by Professor Robert J. Bonner.

Vol. II. (Rome) of Professor Mikhail Rostovtzeff's *History of the Ancient World* has appeared (Oxford University Press).

Vol. III. of *Peuples et Civilisations*, the *Histoire Générale* of Louis Halphen and Philippe Sagnac, is *La Conquête Romaine*, by Professor André Piganiol of Strasbourg (Paris, Alcan, 1927, pp. 520).

Professor Adolf Schulten of Erlangen has been engaged for over a decade on a four-volume work entitled *Numantia*, giving the results of the excavations undertaken there between 1905 and 1912. Vol. I., published in 1914, dealt with *Die Keltiberer und ihre Kriege mit Rom*; vol. III., *Die Lager des Scipio* (Munich, Bruckmann; Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1927, pp. 288) is now at hand; vol. II., dealing with the city of Numantia, and vol. IV., with the camp at Renieblas, are still in prospect. As these are the only discovered camps of the republican period, much new light is thrown on early Roman methods of warfare.

*The Roman Campagna in Classical Times* (London, Benn), by Dr. Thomas Ashby, presents the results of all the archaeological studies in that field which for many years past have been carried on by the author during his long connection with the British School in Rome and by other scholars and excavators.

There has now been published (Rome, Danesi) the first installment of the Italian portion of the general map of the Roman Empire, *Forma Romani Imperii*, which has been resolved upon, as a work of international co-operation, by the Union Académique Internationale. The position of

this first installment in the scheme may be seen from the title, *Forma Italiae, regio I., Latium et Campania*, volumen I., *Ager Pomptinus*, pars I., *Anxur-Tarracina*. The present map, prepared by Signor Giuseppe Lugli and executed on a scale of 1:25,000, indicates the archaeological monuments, and is accompanied by text and illustrations.

Vol. II., pt. I., of Professor Hermann Dessau's *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit* bears the subtitle *Die Kaiser von Tiberius bis Vitellius*, and, the preceding volume having dealt with the imperial administration and the provincial institutions being reserved for later treatment, it is occupied with the personages and events of its period, which are treated with the same competence of workmanship and independence of view that marked vol. I.

The Cambridge University Press announces a history of *The Commerce between the Roman Empire and India*, in the period from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius, by E. H. Warmington.

After an interval of fourteen years, there has appeared a third edition of Berthold Bretholz's *Lateinische Paläographie*, forming part of Aloys Meister's *Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1926, pp. iv, 112).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Morlet, *Le Travail de l'Os, à Glozel* (*Mercure de France*, July 1); *id.*, *Les Vases Inscrits de Glozel* (*ibid.*, July 15); Abel Rey, *Nouveau Coup d'Oeil sur la Mathématique Égyptienne* (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, XLIII.); Ch. Picard, *Le Sanctuaire d'Olympie*, I. (*Journal des Savants*, April); R. Laqueur, *Griechische Urkunden in der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Literatur* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXXVI. 2); A. Merlin, *La Sculpture Antique de Phidias à l'Ère Byzantine*, I. (*Journal des Savants*, June); F. Pellati, *Scavi e Scoperte Archeologiche in Italia* (*Nouva Antologia*, July 1); Harold Mattingly, *Doles in Ancient Rome* (*Edinburgh Review*, July).

#### EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Funk's *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* has in recent editions been so much modified and expanded by the editorial care of Dr. Karl Bihlmeyer that its eighth edition appears under the latter's name, and with an altered title, *Kirchengeschichte auf Grund des Lehrbuches von F. X. von Funk neu bearbeitet*. In the present form of this standard and much-esteemed work, Teil I. (Paderborn, Schöningh, pp. xii, 306) presents the earliest period of Christian history, down to the Council in Trullo.

A manual indispensable to those who work in its field, and marked by large improvements in the present edition, is the eighth-ninth edition of Dr. Gerhard Rauschen's *Grundriss der Patrologie: die Schriften der Kirchenväter und ihr Lehrgehalt* (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1926, pp. xx, 484).

The Oxford University Press has published *Some Authentic Acts of the Early Christian Martyrs*, translated, with notes and introduction by the Rev. E. C. E. Owen.

As a contribution to the intellectual history of the early Church, we note *La Destinée de l'Homme; de l'Influence du Stoïcisme sur la Pensée Chrétienne Primitive*, by P. G. Chappuis (Paris, Fischbacher, 1926, pp. viii, 245). In the field of its institutional growth, K. Völker has written a monograph on *Mysterium und Agape; die Gemeinsamen Mahlzeiten in der Alten Kirche* (Gotha, Klotz, 1927, pp. vi, 223).

The *Iconographie der Heiligen*, by Karl Künstle (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1926, pp. xvi, 608), is appraised as worthy to stand beside the works of Stadler, Potthast, Chevalier, and the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica* of the Bollandists. A second volume, dealing with iconographic theory, is in prospect.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Galtier, *Le Véritable Édît de Calliste* (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, July).

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Professor J. F. Willard's fifth bulletin of the *Progress of Medieval Studies in the United States*, now published annually by the Mediaeval Academy and the University of Colorado, expands annually with the growth of interest in such studies and the increasing effort of its public-spirited compiler. It is an invaluable source of knowledge as to what is going on among us in its field.

The July number of *Speculum* contained an interesting article by Professor Haskins on the Latin Literature of Sport, his presidential address before the Mediaeval Academy of America, and one by Professor C. H. Slover of Texas on William of Malmesbury and the Irish, being a discussion of the part played by that writer in the transmission of Celtic culture to English literary consciousness.

In the *Analecta Bollandiana*, XLV. 1-2, Father Hippolyte Delehaye has a further article on collective letters of indulgence, this time relating to those of the thirteenth century, and also presents an inedited life of St. John the Almoner, patriarch of Alexandria, from a Greek manuscript in the library of St. Mark at Venice; like the life in Metaphrastes, it is based on the lost life by Sophronius and the extant life by Leontius, but preserves much more of the former than is to be found in Metaphrastes.

The Columbia University Press has brought out (in the series *Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies*) *The History of Yaballaha III., Nestorian Patriarch, and of his Vicar, Bar Sauma, Mongol Ambassador to the Frankish Courts at the End of the Thirteenth Century*, translated and edited by James A. Montgomery.



The *Summa Legum Brevis Levis et Utilis* by Raymundus of Wiener-Neustadt, a popular law-book of the fourteenth century, especially used in Austria, Poland, and Hungary, has been newly published by Alexander Gál with the aid of the Savigny Foundation and the Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft (Weimar, Böhlau, 1926, 2 parts, pp. lv, 406, 325).

In the *Catholic Historical Review* for July Dr. James J. Walsh prints an address on the Catholic Background of the Discovery of America, and Sister M. Mildred Curley treats of an Episode in the Conflict between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair.

Mr. S. Harrison Thomson offers as a Princeton dissertation an *editio princeps* of a tract of Hus, from the unique manuscript in the library of the metropolitan chapter of Prague, *Mag. Johannis Hus Tractatus Responsivus* (Princeton University Press, pp. xxxiv, 173), to which he has prefixed a careful introduction based on prolonged studies in Czech and other literature concerning Hus. Opponents of Hus having put forth a list of sixteen positions attributed to him which they declared to be heretical, schismatical, or erroneous, Hus in this tract, written in September, 1412, but never finished, replies respecting seven of these, concerning papal power, absolution, clerical property-holding, indulgences, and excommunication. He incorporates tracts of Master Frederick Epinge and of Jacobellus de Misa. In some sense the tract is a *Vorschrift* of Hus to his *De Ecclesia*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. G. Coulton, *The Inquisition Once More*, II. (Edinburgh Review, July); G. Mollat, *Épisodes du Siècle du Palais des Papes au Temps de Benoît XIII., 1398-1399* (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, July).

#### MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*A History of Europe and the Modern World, 1492-1914*, by R. B. Mowat, is published by the Oxford University Press.

Of interest for intellectual history is *Die Astrologie des Johannes Kepler; eine Auswahl aus seinen Schriften*, edited with introduction by Heinrich Arthur Strauss and Sigrid Strauss-Kloebe (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1926, pp. 232).

The period from the Thirty Years' War to the earlier wars of Louis XIV. is covered by the learned *Histoire des Négociations Diplomatiques entre la France et la Transylvanie au XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle, 1635-1683*, by I. Hudita (Paris, Gamber, 1927, pp. 436). Accompanying it is a separate *Répertoire des Documents* (pp. 272).

*Une Ambassade à Constantinople; la Politique Orientale de la Révolution Française*, is the work of E. de Marcère and forms part of the *Bibliothèque d'Histoire Contemporaine* (Paris, Alcan, 1927, 2 vols., pp. 768).

Leibniz's long-continued efforts for the reconciliation of the Protestant and Catholic churches are fully recounted by Dr. C. J. Gordon in a treatise on *The Union of the Churches: a Study of Leibnitz and his Great Attempt* (London, Constable).

To the *Répertoire Général des Ouvrages Modernes relatifs au Dix-Huitième Siècle* (reviewed in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXII. 357), the editor, Vicomte Charles du Peloux, has now added, in a separate brochure under the same title, a *Supplément* and a *Table Méthodique*. The *Table Méthodique* consists of the names of authors alphabetically arranged under certain captions indicating subject matter. The *Supplément* consists of thirty pages of new titles of works relating to the colonies, the American War of Independence, and the beginnings of the French Revolution.

Vol. 6 of the *Handbuch der Politik* is composed of documents in the field of modern history from 1789 to Locarno, coupled with extracts from political and philosophical literature, selected by Professor Mendelssohn Bartholdy (Berlin, Rothschild, 1926, pp. 524).

The lectures given in 1926 on the Sir George Watson Foundation by Professor Robert McElroy of Oxford have been published by the Cambridge University Press under the title *The Pathway of Peace: an Interpretation of some British-American Crises* (pp. x, 192). Popular in form, and appropriately lenient toward the less amiable aspects of British public action toward the United States, the volume deals most largely with the renunciation of the French alliance, the Jay Treaty, the disputes leading to the War of 1812, the Monroe Declaration, the Venezuela imbroglio, and the World Court.

The Houghton Mifflin Company publishes in America *The History of Reparations*, by Carl Bergmann, of which the English edition was mentioned in our last number.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Henri Sée, *Dans Quelle Mesure Puritains et Juifs ont-ils contribué aux Progrès du Capitalisme Moderne?* (*Revue Historique*, May-June); Inna Lubimenko, *England's Part in the Discovery of Russia* (*Slavonic Review*, June); F. Rodríguez Pomar, *El Partido Imperial en la Elección de Paulo IV. y los Comienzos de la Política Religiosa de Felipe II.*, I, II. (*Razon y Fe*, LXXVII. 5, 6); Herbert Stegemann, *Aus den Papieren des Grafen Balmain, Russischen Kommissars auf St. Helena von 1816-1820* (*Archiv für Politik und Geschichte*, V. 6); G. Pagès, *L'Affaire du Luxembourg*, concl. (*Revue d'Histoire Moderne*, December, 1926); *Bibliographie zur Auswärtigen Politik* [1926-1927] (*Europäische Gespräche*, July).

#### THE WORLD WAR

The first volume (of two) of Professor Sidney B. Fay's long-expected book on the origins of the World War is to be published this autumn.

*Five Weeks: the Surge of Public Opinion on the Eve of the Great War* (New York, John Day Co., pp. 304), prepared by Professor Jonathan F. Scott from the European newspapers of the time, gives the record of editorial opinions, reports of parades and mobs, the fluctuation of prices, and the despatches in which foreign correspondents described the changing currents of public sentiments.

The World War on the Western Front has been abundantly treated; the story of the Eastern Front is still imperfectly known. It has been especially difficult to form an exact estimate of the military effort expended by Russia. Hence there is a special welcome for *La Russie dans la Guerre Mondiale, 1914-1917* (Paris, Payot, 1927), the French translation of a volume by General Yurii Danilov, who served successively as quartermaster-general, corps and army commander during the war.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Friedrich Ritter von Wiesner, *Das Mémoire Oesterreich-Ungarns über die GrossSerbische Propaganda und deren Zusammenhänge mit dem Sarajevoer Attentat* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, June); Émile Bourgeois, *Les Archives d'État et l'Enquête sur les Origines de la Guerre Mondiale* [searching critique of vol. I. of *Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette*] (Revue Historique, May-June); Theobald von Schäfer, *Wollte Generaloberst v. Moltke den Präventivkrieg?* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, June); Michael T. Florinsky, *The Russian Mobilization of 1914* (Political Science Quarterly, June); Arthur Weber, *Graf Tisza und der Eintritt Italiens in den Weltkrieg* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, July); Joh. V. Bredt, *Der Geplante Flottenvorstoss Ende 1918* (Preussische Jahrbücher, May).

#### GREAT BRITAIN

General review: F. Cabrol, *Courrier Anglais; Angleterre et Amérique* [1925-1927] (Revue des Questions Historiques, July).

The Macmillan Company has brought out *A Political and Social History of England*, by Professor Frederick C. Dietz of the University of Illinois.

Macmillan has published, in the *Great English Churchmen* series, *St. Thomas of Canterbury*, by Sidney Dark, *The Life of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury*, by Anthony C. Deane, and *John Wesley*, by Rev. William H. Hutton.

*The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, by Eddius Stephanus, text, translation, and notes, by Bertram Colgrave, lecturer in English in the University of Durham, makes available to students one of the most important sources for early English history.

Under the title *The Statesman's Book of John of Salisbury*, Mr. John Dickinson of Harvard University has translated books IV., V., and VI. of the *Policraticus*, and selections from books VII. and VIII. The volume, published by A. A. Knopf, has an introduction of 66 pages by Mr. Dickin-

son on the Place of the *Policraticus* in the Development of Political Thought.

The canonical position of the earlier papal legates to England, their legislative, administrative, and judicial functions, are competently treated in an inaugural dissertation by Fräulein Helene Tillmann, *Die Päpstlichen Legaten in England bis zur Beendigung der Legation Gualas, 1218* (Bonn, 1926, pp. xii, 162).

In eight volumes, published at intervals from this autumn to next April, Mr. Basil Blackwell of Oxford will bring out the "Shakespeare Head" edition of *Froissarts Cronycles*.

The Manchester University Press puts forth, in a volume carefully edited by V. H. Galbraith, assistant lecturer in history, a valuable chronicle of the years 1333-1381, written in French, of which an extract was used by Stow and printed thirty years ago by Mr. Trevelyan in the *English Historical Review*, but which has otherwise been unknown. The manuscript, originally written at St. Mary's Abbey, York, is now in the possession of Lieut.-Col. Sir William Ingilby of Ripley Castle. The book is entitled *An Anonimalle Chronicle*.

Dr. George P. Gooch's learned and authoritative volume on *English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century*, published in 1898, has been out of print since 1906. A second edition, now brought out by the Cambridge University Press, includes some verbal corrections by the author, a few additions by Professor Harold J. Laski to the foot-notes, embodying references to recent publications, and brief appendixes by the latter on the influence of Harrington in America, on the movement for law reform under the Commonwealth, and on the influence in France of the Revolution of 1688.

*A Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1620-1800*, by Ronald S. Crane and others, has been issued by the University of North Carolina Press.

*Essays on Old London* (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan, pp. ix, 78), by Sidney Perks, surveyor to the Corporation of the City, consists of three archaeological monographs, with twenty-eight excellent illustrations and three appendixes. The first monograph is on the restoration and recent discoveries at the Guildhall; the second on London town-planning schemes in 1666, consequent on the Great Fire (the author especially criticizes Wren's plans); the third, a paper read before the Royal Institute of British Architects, on the scheme for a Thames Embankment developed at that same time.

Mr. E. M. Wrong's *History of England, 1688-1815* (London, Williams and Norgate, "Home University Library", pp. 250) is no congested cram-book, but an outline marked by thought and distinction.

*The House of Lords in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford University Press), by A. S. Turberville, is by main intention a history of the Whig oligarchy.

The Navy Record Society has published vol. II. of *Letters of Admiral of the Fleet the Earl of St. Vincent*, ed. D. B. Smith, covering the period, 1801-1804, of his administration as First Lord of the Admiralty, and including, in an appendix, a defensive survey of his administration by his associates, entitled "Memoirs". The society has also published the first volume of *The Keith Papers*, selected from the letters and papers of Admiral Viscount Keith, and edited by W. G. Perrin, librarian of the Admiralty. Some light is cast on the siege of Charleston in 1780. The volume ends with the conquest of the Cape Colony from the Dutch in 1795.

*Lord Brougham and the Whig Party* (Publications of the University of Manchester, *History Series*, no. 47), by Arthur Aspinall, is from the press of Longmans.

*The Migration of British Capital, to 1875*, by Professor Leland H. Jenks of Rollins College (New York, A. A. Knopf, pp. xi, 442), is a profitable history of Britain's foreign investments and of the manner in which this outflow has influenced the extension overseas of the British economic system.

*The Letters of Lady Augusta Stanley, a Young Lady at Court, 1849-1863*, edited by the Dean of Windsor and Hector Bolitho, is published in New York by Messrs. Doran.

A volume of the *Letters of Queen Victoria*, of the period 1879-1885, edited like its predecessors by Mr. George E. Buckle, is to be published this autumn by the house of John Murray.

The second and final volume of Sir Sidney Lee's *Life of King Edward VII.*, completed in some particulars by S. F. Markham, is in the press.

The fourth volume of the publications of the English Place-Names Society, published during the summer, deals with *The Place-Names of Worcestershire*.

Dr. Thomas A. Walker, lecturer and librarian of Peterhouse, Cambridge, has issued through the Cambridge University Press a *Biographical Register of Peterhouse Men and some of their Neighbours from the Earliest Days (1284) to the Commencement (1616) of the First Admission Book of the College*, part I., 1284-1574 (pp. x, 324), which when completed will bring the record to 1911, the admissions from 1615 to that year having been published by the same press in 1912. The present compilation, showing painstaking care and great industry, is based upon an examination of diocesan registries, especially the registry at Ely, early records of the college, and county and family papers, and is prefaced by an account of the foundation and of Hugo de Balsham, founder and benefactor.

The *Scottish Historical Review* for July has papers on the Origin of the House of Stewart, by J. T. T. Brown, and on the First Earl Marischal (William, third Lord Keith, created Earl Marischal in 1458).

Mr. W. Mackay Mackenzie's volume on *The Mediaeval Castle in Scotland* (London, Methuen) contains the Rhind Lectures on Archaeology delivered by him in 1925-1926.

British government publications: *Calendar of Chancery Warrants*, 1244-1326; *Calendar of Close Rolls*, Richard II., VI., 1396-1399; *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign*, XXI., pt. I., June, 1586-June, 1588, ed. S. C. Lomas; *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English Affairs, in Venice and Northern Italy*, XXVIII., 1643-1647, ed. A. B. Hinds; *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, third series, vol. X., 1684-1685, ed. Henry Paton, introd. by R. K. Hannay.

Other documentary publications: *The Earliest Lincolnshire Assize Rolls*, 1202-1209, ed. Doris M. Stenton (Lincoln Record Society).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. M. Stenton, *The Free Peasantry of the Northern Danelaw* (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund, 1925-1926); James Tait, *The Firma Burgi and the Commune in England, 1066-1191* (English Historical Review, July); G. Constant, *Politique et Dogma dans les Confessions de Foi d'Henri VIII., Roi d'Angleterre* (Revue Historique, May-June); Kennedy Stewart, *The Scottish Parliament, 1690-1702*, I. (Juridical Review, March); H. M. Lackland, *Lord William Bentinck in Sicily, 1811-1812* (English Historical Review, July); Egon Heymann, *Die Wirtschaftsimperiale Idee in England* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, V. 5); Jacques Oudiette, *La Conférence Impériale Britannique de 1926* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, April-June).

#### IRELAND AND THE DOMINIONS

(For Canada, see p. 243; for India, see p. 230.)

In a small book entitled *The Law of the Lord's Day in the Celtic Church* (Edinburgh, Clark) Dr. Donald Maclean prints a translation of the Cáin Domnaigh, an early law tract (the translator places it in the sixth century, others in the ninth), enjoining a sabbatical Sunday.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Eoin MacNeill, *Ireland and Wales in the History of Jurisprudence* (Studies, June).

#### FRANCE

By decree of May 24 the Minister of Foreign Affairs has permitted that, provided in each case the consent of the "Direction des Affaires Politiques et Commerciales" has been obtained, persons occupied with historical researches may have access to those portions of the archives of the ministry known as "Correspondance Politique" and "Mémoires et Documents" from Dec. 2, 1852 (hitherto the *terminus ad quem*), to May 10, 1871.

Gabriel Hanotaux's *Histoire de la Nation Française* receives a formidable augmentation in the *Histoire Économique et Financière de la France*



by Professor Germain Martin of the Paris Faculté de Droit (Paris, Plon, 1927, pp. 655).

Mr. O. M. Dalton's *Gregory of Tours* has been brought out by the Clarendon Press in two volumes: the first of a general and introductory nature; the second a translation, with many explanatory and illustrative notes.

Vol. IV. of *Les Grandes Chroniques de France*, published by Jules Viard, embraces chronicles of the period from *Louis le Débonnaire à Louis VI.* (Paris, Champion, 1927, pp. 380).

A collection of 700 facsimile reproductions of titles, colophons, and specimen-pages (mainly of illustrated books) has been published as *Documents sur la Typographie et la Gravure en France au Quinzième et au Seizième Siècles*, brought together by the late A. Claudin, the well-known historian of French printing, with introduction and bibliographical letter-press by Seymour de Ricci. Only 200 copies have been printed.

In a work begun before the war and now published in three volumes quarto, with illustrations, M. Armand Garnier, professor in the Lycée Henri IV., treats with authority of *Agrippa d'Aubigné et le Parti Protestant* (Paris, Fischbacher), combining political and military, and to some extent literary, biography with the political history of the period.

Among the books on one or another phase of the history of art, issued by the house of Van Oest (Paris and Brussels), the following are offered for subscription (1927): *La Gravure en France au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle; la Gravure dans le Livre et l'Ornement*, by J. Lieure; *Dessins de Maîtres Anciens*, by M. Delacre and P. Lavallée; *Le Fer Forgé en France aux XVI<sup>e</sup> et XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècles*, by L. Blanc; *A. G. Perret et l'Architecture du Béton Armé*, by P. Jamot; *Charles-Nicolas Cochin, Graveur et Dessinateur*, by S. Rocheblave; all single quartos of about 100 pages with illustrations. There is, further, vol. I. of *Les Trésors des Bibliothèques de France*, by R. Cantinelli and Ém. Dacier, being fascs. I.-V. of the whole work, each fascicle to contain part or all of a rare manuscript in facsimile, besides articles and plates in black and white or in color; also, a new, revised edition of *Les Ébénistes du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle; leurs Oeuvres, et leurs Marques*, by Count François de Salverte (pp. 400), whose first edition, in 1923, was exhausted in a few months.

*Les Assemblées du Clergé de France avant 1789 et leurs Jétions Commémoratifs*, by Ch. Florange and S. Strowski, furnishes an interesting documentation on the struggle between Mazarin and Retz, the *dons gratuits*, the contest between Church and crown, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the bull Unigenitus, Jansenism, the tax for the widows and orphans of the American War, and other matters.

The Old Régime lives anew in the biographies of two original and widely different individuals, *L'Aumônier des Corsaires, l'Abbé Jouin*,

1672-1720, by Étienne Dupont (Nantes, Durance, 1926, pp. xxxiii, 187) and *La Marquise de Créqui; Portraits et Documents Inédits*, by Paul Tisseau (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1927, pp. xi, 231).

*La Cour de Monsieur, Frère de Louis XIV.*, is described by Guy de la Batut for Émile Magne's series, *Ames et Visages d'Autrefois* (Paris, Michel, 1927, pp. 312).

In 1766, Louis XV. appointed a commission of five archbishops and five councillors of state to propose a scheme of monastic reform; the report was conceived in the spirit of the *philosophes* and is said to have prepared the way for the abolition of the orders in 1790. It is studied by Suzanne Lemaire in *La Commission des Réguliers, 1766-1780* (Paris, Tenin, 1926, pp. xiv, 258).

The Vanguard Press has brought out in the series of *Social Science Classics*, Prince Kropotkin's *The Great French Revolution, 1789-1793*, in two volumes, translated by N. F. Dryhurst.

The *Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire Économique de la Révolution Française* is further enriched by a volume of *Cahiers des Curés et des Communautés Ecclésiastiques du Bailliage d'Auxerre pour les États Généraux de 1789*, edited by Charles Porée (Paris, Leroux, 1927, pp. 596).

*Merlin de Thionville, d'après des Documents Inédits*, by Roger Merlin, is of importance to those interested in the Revolutionary, Thermidorian, and Directory periods, in all of which the subject of this study was active (Paris, Alcan, 1927, 2 vols., pp. viii, 851).

Materials for the religious history of the Revolution will be found in *Les Actes des Prêtres Insermentés de l'Archidiocèse de Rennes Guillotinés en 1794*, published from documentary originals by the Abbé Auguste Lemasson, who some ten years ago performed a similar service in relation to the priests of the diocese of Saint-Brieuc (Rennes, Secrétariat de l'Archevêché, 1927, pp. xxiii, 288).

Recent additions to Napoleonic literature in German are *Memoiren Napoleons I.*, by the well-known specialist F. M. Kircheisen, being a compilation from the authentic writings of Bonaparte and his friends (Dresden, Aretz, 1927, pp. 350), and *Memoiren der Gräfin Kielmanns-egge über Napoleon I.*, edited from the original manuscript by Gertrude Aretz (*ibid.*, 1927, pp. 400).

An elaborate work has been written on *Le Vicomte Lainé et la Vie Parlementaire au Temps de la Restauration* by Émile de Perceval, the subject having been an opponent of Napoleon, president of the Chamber, minister and peer of France, living from 1767 to 1835 (Paris, Champion, 1927, 2 vols., pp. 400, 560).

Vol. III. of the *Mémoires de la Reine Hortense* is now available (Paris, Plon, 1927, pp. 400).

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXIII.—15.

The second volume of the Comtesse D'Agoult's *Mémoires* covers the years 1833-1854 (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1927, pp. 264).

A new *Histoire de Lorraine* has been published by Édouard Gérardin, the first volume reaching from feudal origins to 1766, the second to the present (Paris, Berger, 1927, pp. xii, 372, 188).

A recent regional history of great comprehensiveness is René Surugue's *Le Nivernais et la Nièvre depuis les Origines Gauloises jusqu'à nos Jours* (Paris, Ficker, 1927, 2 vols., pp. 1390).

The Yale University Press has brought out (in the *Economic and Social History of the World War*, translated and abridged series) *Agriculture and Food Supply in France during the War*, by Michel Augé-Laribé and Pierre Pinot.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Enlart, *La Sculpture Française du Moyen-Age* (Journal des Savants, April); Em. Roy, *Les Jeux du Roi et de la Reine* (Le Moyen Age, XXVIII.); Marcel Gouron, *Aliénor de Castille en Guienne, 1286-1289* (*ibid.*); J. Calmette, *La Cour des Valois de Bourgogne* (Journal des Savants, May); M. Dubruel, *Les Congrégations des Affaires de France sous Innocent XI., II.* (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, July); Pierre Caumont, *L'Administration de Turgot en Limousin* (Nouvelle Revue, June 15); A. Aulard, *Lettres Inédites de Voltaire à Fyot de la Marche* (Revue de Paris, July 1); G. Lacour-Gayet, *Talleyrand à la Veille de la Révolution* (*ibid.*, May 15); *id.*, *Talleyrand, Evêque d'Autun* (*ibid.*, July 15); Leo Gershoy, *Barère, Anacreon of the Guillotine* (South Atlantic Quarterly, July); Paul Marmottan, *Joseph Bonaparte Diplomate* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XLI. 3); Albert Pingaud, *Lamartine Chargé d'Affaires 1826-1828* (*ibid.*); Lucien Corpechot, *La Société sous le Règne de Louis-Philippe* (Revue de Paris, July 1); Pietro Silva, *La Politica di Napoleone III. in Italia*, concl. (Nuova Rivista Storica, May-August); J. Dontenville, *L'Essai de Restauration Monarchique au Lendemain de la Guerre de 1870*, I., II. (Nouvelle Revue, June 1, 15).

#### ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

General review: R. Konetzke, *Spanischer Literaturbericht* [1914-1925] (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXVI. 1).

The Istituto Storico Italiano will soon resume, after a long interruption, the publication of the series of *Regesta Chartarum Italiae*. Those promised in the near future are vol. IV. of the *Regeste di Camaldoli*; vol. II. of the *Regeste della Chiesa di Ravenna*; vol. II. of the *Largitorio Farfense*. Later the series will be continued with the publication of the *Regesto di Modena* and the *Regesto di Santa Maria de Monte Vellate*.

With the death of Vittorio Fiorini, publication of the new edition of the *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* of Muratori has passed to the Istituto

Storico Italiano, and is now under the editorial direction of Signor Pietro Fedele, minister of education. Twenty-one volumes of Muratori's original twenty-five have appeared or are on the way to publication. An account of the present state and immediate prospects of this important undertaking will be found in the *Archivio Storico Italiano* of May 15.

*Italia, Genti e Favelle*, is an anthropological and linguistic description of the Italian population from prehistoric to present times, by Francesco L. Pullé (Turin, Bocca, 1927, 2 vols., pp. cir. 600). The work is accompanied by an atlas, containing 60 geographical-ethnographical maps.

In *Die Geschichte der Sizilischen Flotte unter der Regierung Friedrichs II., 1197-1250* (Breslau, Priebatsch, 1926, pp. 153), Willy Cohn continues the development which he has already traced from 1060 to 1154.

The president of the College of St. Bonaventura, Father Leonardo Lemmens, has performed a useful service to students of early Franciscan history by bringing together and carefully editing, from chronicles, books of legends and sermons, liturgical books, private letters, and public documents, those *Testimonia Minora Saeculi XIII. de S. Francisco Assisiensi* (Quaracchi, 1926, pp. 127) which supplement the main and well-known original sources.

Signor Arnaldo Fortini's *Nuova Vita di San Francesco offerta dalla Città di Assisi al Mondo Devoto in ricordo del VII. Centenario della Morte de lui* (Milan, "Alpes", 1926, pp. 481) is chiefly to be valued for its extraordinarily complete, vivid, and authoritative depicting of the milieu of the saint, the feudal and communal life of Assisi in his time.

J. M. Dent and Sons publish the first English translation of Luca Landucci's diary, *A Florentine Diary from 1450 to 1516*, continued by an anonymous writer to 1542, with notes by Iodoco del Badia.

The issue of the *Rivista d'Italia* for June 15 is devoted to articles by a group of distinguished writers celebrating the fourth centenary of the death of Niccolò Machiavelli.

The publisher Ulrico Hoepli, Swiss by origin, long established in Milan, has celebrated his eightieth birthday by the publication of a sumptuous volume recording *Tre Secoli di Vita Milanese* (the last three). The text, 900 large pages, is by the Milanese scholars A. Bertarelli and A. Monti. The illustrations—610 photo-engravings, nineteen facsimiles, nine colored plates—illustrate every aspect of Milanese life, official and social.

Two more volumes of Italo Raulich's *Storia del Risorgimento Italiano*—vol. IV., covering the period March to November, 1848, and vol. V., devoted to 1849—have been published by Zanichelli at Bologna. These are the last, for the author, distinguished editor of the *Rassegna Storica del Risorgimento Italiano*, died in May, 1925, leaving his great work a fragment.

A well-documented survey of the rôle of Italy in the World War is M. Rudiger's *Ceux de la Piave*, with 25 sketches at the front by Raemaekers (Paris, Éditions du Scribe, 1927, pp. 200).

Dr. Edgar Prestage, Camoens professor in the University of London, publishes (Watford, 1927) a pamphlet on *The Royal Power and the Cortes in Portugal*, in which, on the basis of Professor M. P. Nerêa's *O Poder Real e as Cortes* (Coimbra, 1923) and other sources, he sets forth, in a manner instructive to the student of constitutional history elsewhere, the peculiarities of a medieval constitution in which feudalism never took root.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Schipa, *Napoli nella Storia dell' Alto Medio Evo* (Nuova Antologia, July 1); Gabriel Brunet, *Machiavel* (Mercure de France, June 15); Comte Serge Fleury, *Les Difficultés d'une Ambassade dans la République Cisalpine* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); Guido Bustico, *Gioacchino Murat nelle Memorie inedite del Generale Rossetti* (Nuova Antologia, May 16, June 1, 16); G. Masera, *Il Confidente Spirituale di Camillo Cavour* (La Lettura, June 1); A. Colombo, *Quintino Sella* (*ibid.*, July 1); Manuel Torres, *El Estado Visigótico* (Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español, III.); H. Sée, *Documents sur le Commerce de Cadix, 1691-1752*, III. (Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises, XV. 2).

#### GERMANY, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

The *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, XXIII. 4, contains a *Bibliographie zur Deutschen Geschichte*, running to thirty pages, and covering mainly publications of 1923 and 1924; it is compiled by Friedrich Busch, librarian in Hanover.

A very able investigation of *Die Entstehung des Deutschen Grundeigentums* has been made by Viktor Ernst on the basis of his thorough knowledge of the legal and economic history of the Swabian towns; their especial importance lies in the fact that the Neckar region was occupied from 150 to 200 years before the country on the left bank of the Rhine (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1926, pp. 140).

Medieval German commerce has usually been treated either from the standpoint of the single city or institution, or in general works like those of Kötzschke, of Inama-Sternegg, and of Sombart. A middle ground has been taken with success by Hans-Joachim Seeger in his *Westfalens Handel und Gewerbe vom 9. bis zum Beginn des 14. Jahrhunderts* (*Studien zur Geschichte der Wirtschaft und Geisteskultur*, Bd. I.; Berlin, Curtius, 1926, pp. xvi, 163), proving that Westphalia was in the Middle Ages, as it still is to-day, a great economic unit.

The publication of the *Regesten der Bischöfe von Strassburg*, edited by A. Hessel and M. Krebs, has reached vol. II., fasc. 4, covering the end of the thirteenth century (Innsbruck, Wagner, 1926, pp. 279-406).

The monograph by Hermann Nestler on *Die Wiedertäuferbewegung in Regensburg* (Regensburg, Habbel, 1926, pp. 148) is based on archival material, there preserved and here reproduced in extenso.

Vol. XII. of the Prussian Academy's *Acta Borussica: Denkmäler der Preussischen Staatsverwaltung im 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, Parey, 1926, pp. 760), edited by Martin Hass, Wolfgang Peters, and Ernst Posner, completes the development during the Seven Years' War, the earlier part of which is discussed in the preceding volume.

The firm of Lorentz at Leipzig offers the complete collection *Der Deutsche Staatsgedanke; die Klassiker seiner Geschichte*, containing fifteen volumes (pp. 5085) of source-material from the writings of past leaders, including Möser (Karl Brandt ed.), Fichte (Otto Braun ed.), Stein (Hans Thimme ed.), Görres (Arno Duch ed.), Radowitz (Fr. Meinecke ed.), Bismarck (Hans Rothfels ed.), etc.

The life of *Königin Luise* has been restudied from the sources by Gertrude Aretz (Dresden, Aretz, 1927, pp. 320).

Under the title *Friedrich Daniel Bassermann, Mitglied des Badischen Landtags, des Vorparlaments, der Deutschen Nationalversammlung, und des Reichsministeriums* (Frankfurt a.M., Frankfurter Verlags-Anstalt, 1926, pp. 327), the family of this notable "Forty-eighter" have finally caused his important memoirs to be printed.

A critical study has been made for the first time of *Richard Wagners Verbannung und Rückkehr 1849-1862* by Woldemar Lippert, director of the Saxon state archives (Dresden, Aretz, 1927, pp. 270).

The earlier and later years of Bismarck have been minutely investigated, but until the opening of the Austrian archives after the fall of the monarchy, it was not possible to give a satisfactory account of the middle period. This lacuna has been filled by the Göttingen historian, Arnold O. Meyer, with his new book, *Bismarcks Kampf mit Oesterreich am Bundestag zu Frankfurt 1851-1859* (Leipzig and Berlin, Koehler, 1927, pp. xii, 598).

The third series in the *Werk des Untersuchungsausschusses der Verfassungsgebenden Deutschen Nationalversammlung und des Deutschen Reichstages 1919-1926* takes up the knotty question of *Völkerrecht im Weltkrieg*, presenting official German and other records on the subject of atrocities and violations of international law, as charged by both sides. The editors are Johannes Bell, imperial minister of justice, Eugen Fischer, and Berthold Widmann (Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 4 vols., pp. 2420). The fourth series concerns itself with *Die Ursachen des Deutschen Zusammenbruchs im Jahre 1918*, containing, besides many sorts of documents, the expert opinions of Colonel Schwertfeger and General von Kuhl, together with the report of Dr. Hans Delbrück, the whole edited by Albrecht Philipp, E. Fischer, and Walther Bloch (Berlin,



Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 3 vols., pp. 1346).

A complete survey of Austrian documentary seals from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries has been made by Paul Kletler in *Die Kunst im Oesterreichischen Siegel* (Vienna, Krystall-Verlag, 1927, pp. 80 with 40 plates); they constitute an important source for art and social history because of their number and the relative ease with which they can be dated. The work forms vol. VII. of the series *Artes Austriae; Studien zur Kunstgeschichte Oesterreichs*.

The great work of Josef Redlich, *Das Oesterreichische Staats- und Reichsproblem; Geschichtliche Darstellung der Inneren Politik der Habsburgischen Monarchie von 1848 bis zum Untergange des Reiches*, has reached its second volume, which deals in much detail with the years 1861-1867 (Leipzig, Neuer-Geist-Verlag, 1926, pp. viii, 847).

The latest volume (XXXIV.) of the *Mémoires et Documents* of the Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie of Geneva is entirely occupied with an elaborate critical monograph, by M. Édouard L. Burnet, on *Le Premier Tribunal Révolutionnaire Genevois* (pp. 454), in which the history of that sanguinary tribunal and its predecessor the Committee of Seven is traced, July 19-August 10, 1794, as fully as the disappearance of their archives permits. The book is a model of search, sifting, and combination, and makes, in its restricted field, an instructive contribution to the history of violent revolution.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Bernhard Schmeidler, *Königtum und Fürstentum in Deutschland in der Mittelalterlichen Kaiserzeit* (Preussische Jahrbücher, June); Lutz Korodi, *König Ferdinand I. und sein Reich* (*ibid.*); Hugo Rachel, *Aus Leibniz' Politischer Gedankenwelt* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, V. 5); A. E. Brinckmann, *Barock und Rokoko in Süddeutschland* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXVI. 2); Walther Schneider, *Freiherr vom Stein und Erzbischof Graf von Spiegel; ein Briefwechsel*, I., concl. (Deutsche Rundschau, June, July); Albert Pražak, *Czechs and Slovaks after the Revolution of 1848* (Slavonic Review, June); Feldmarschalleutnant Dr. Karl Freiherr von Bardolff, *Franz Ferdinand* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, July); anon., *Fin d'Ambassade à Berlin 1912-1914* (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 15); Emil Daniels, *Die Ursachen unseres Zusammenbruchs* (Preussische Jahrbücher, July); Siegfried Kawerau, *Les Livres d'Histoire en Allemagne, notamment depuis 1923* (Paix par le Droit, March); Hermann Haering, *Die Zukunft des Dahlmann-Waitz* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXVI. 2).

#### NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

The *Economisch-Historisch Jaarboek*, XII. (the Hague, Nijhoff, pp. cxv, 214) contains, beside documents illustrative of Dutch trade in 1833 and 1834 and an important correspondence on economic questions between

G. K. van Hogendorp and Professor Ackersdijk, 1826-1828, an interesting group of contemporary dialogues on the trade and speculation in tulips in 1636 and 1637.

Because of the fundamental value of studies in the realm of population-movements, one welcomes the thoughtful discussion for the Flemish language-area presented by G. Des Marez, archivist, professor and authority on medieval Ghent, under the title *Le Problème de la Colonisation Franque et du Régime Agraire dans la Basse-Belgique* (Brussels, Hayer, 1926).

In a Flemish dissertation of Louvain origin, *De Invallen der Hongaren: hun Groote Inval in Lotharingen ten Jare 954* (Antwerp, L. Opdebeek, pp. 156), Dr. Eugène Daniëls treats carefully of the invasion of the Hungarians in the year named, and their attacks on Cambrai (their "furthest West") and on various monasteries and towns in Belgium and the region just to the east.

Count Louis de Lichtervelde, in his important work on *Léopold II.* (Paris, Plon; Brussels, Dervillé, 1927, pp. 430), studies the whole career of that monarch, in Belgian, in European, and in colonial affairs.

#### NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

General reviews: J. Porcher, *Courrier Slave; Russie* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); H. F. Schmid, *Die Wichtigsten neueren Hilfsmittel zur Einführung in die Rechtsgeschichte der Slavischen Völker* (Zeitschrift für Osteuropäisches Recht, II.).

The first *levering* of the Norwegian *Historisk Tidsskrift* for 1927, concluding vol. XXVII., contains a very full bibliography of Norwegian history for 1924 and 1925, with authors' index to the series of these biennial bibliographies for the period 1916-1925. The second *levering*, beginning vol. XXVIII., opens with an investigation, by Professor Alexander Bugge, of the whole process of early settlement in a specimen district, Brunlanes in Vestfold. This is followed by an elaborate paper, by Johan Schreiner, on the relations of King Olav the Saint to the neighboring lands of Sweden and Denmark-England, and a shorter paper on the territorial development of Normandy, by J. Adigard des Gautries.

Mr. L. Laursen, of the Danish Rigsarkiv, has brought out a seventh volume of his masterly edition of *Danmark-Norges Traktater* (Copenhagen, Gad, pp. 690), covering the period of shifting alliances from 1676 to 1682.

The first of the Scandinavian series of Professor Shotwell's Carnegie Endowment volumes on the economic and social history of the recent war is a general survey of social, financial, and commercial conditions in Sweden, by Professor Eli F. Heckscher, *Bidrag till Sveriges Ekonomiska och Sociala Historia under och efter Världskriget* (Stockholm, Norstedt; New Haven, Yale University Press, 2 vols., pp. xv, 365; viii, 304).

The Permanent Historical-Archaeographical Commission of the Russian Academy of Sciences has taken up the work of the old commission and has brought out a number of new and revised editions of rare chronicles, in the series *Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei*. The following have appeared in the recent period: tom. I., pt. I., fasc. 1, *Lavrentevskaia Letopis*; *Povest Vremennykh Letopis* (Leningrad, 1926); tom. II., fasc. 1, *Ipatevskaia Letopis* (1923); tom. IV., pt. I., fasc. 2, *Novgorodskaia Chetvertaia Letopis* (1925); tom. V., pt. I., fasc. 1, *Sofiskaia Pervaia Letopis* (1925); tom. XV., fasc. 1, *Rogozhskii Letopisets* (1922); tom. XXIV., *Tipografaskaia Letopis* (1921). The Academy has also brought out two volumes of the *Russkaia Historicheskaia Biblioteka*: tom. XXXVII., *Monastyrskie Prikhodo-Roskhodnye Knigi* (1924); and tom. XXXVIII., book IV., *Dela Tainogo Prikaza* (1926).

Two other recent historical works of great interest are: F. I. Uspenski, *Vizantiiski Vremennik*, tom. XXIV. (Leningrad, 1926), and B. D. Grekov, *Plan Chasti Novgoroda Kontsa XVII. Veka* (*ibid.*).

Alfred A. Knopf has published the *Memoirs of Catherine the Great*, translated by Katharine S. Anthony.

Memoirs of A. Savinsky, who was chief of the Russian bureau of foreign affairs from 1901 to 1910 and Russian minister in Bulgaria from 1910 to 1915, are published in English by Messrs. Hutchinson of London, *Recollections of a Russian Diplomat*.

*La Russie avant le Dêbâcle*, by the Princess Stéphanie Dolgorouki, mentioned in our last number, has also been issued in an English translation, *Russia before the Crash* (Paris, Herbert Clarke).

More light is cast on the last years of the Russian monarchy and notably on the personality of Rasputin by the publication of *Souvenirs de ma Vie*, the memoirs of Anna Viroubova, *dame d'honneur* of the empress Alexandra Feodorovna. The book, which is translated from Russian by N. Bogoraze, contains 29 letters written by the Tsar and members of his family during their captivity (Paris, Payot, 1927, pp. 288). Of equal, if not greater importance is the stenographic report of the *Interrogatoires des Ministres, Conseillers, Généraux, Hauts Fonctionnaires de la Cour Impériale Russe par la Commission Extraordinaire du Gouvernement Provisoire de 1917*, the French translation being by J. Polonsky (*ibid.*, 1927, pp. 592).

Miss Margaret S. Miller has made a solid and valuable contribution to Russian history in the period just before the war by her volume on *The Economic Development of Russia, 1905-1914* (London, P. S. King and Son, pp. xviii, 311).

The Macmillan Company has brought out *The Famine in Russia, 1919-1923: the Operations of the American Relief Administration*, by H. H. Fisher.

One of the useful, if elusive, fields of history is the study of international intellectual influences. Here should be classified the monograph on *Les Idées Françaises et la Mentalité Politique en Pologne au XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, by Marcel Handelsman (Paris, Alcan, 1927, pp. 215).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. Leclercq, *Les Corsaires Algériens en Islande en 1627* (Académie Royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres, XII. 11-12); Eduard von Wertheimer, *Charakteristik zweier Zaren aus der Feder des Botschafters v. Schweinitz* (Preussische Jahrbücher, June); Gunther Frantz, *Russlands Werben um Verbündete im Weltkriege* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, June); Otto Korfes, *Die Russische Eismeerküste im Kriege* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, V. 6).

### SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

General review: V. Ćorović, *Histoire Yougoslave* (Revue Historique, May-June).

The late Count Alexander Apponyi was the greatest bibliophile of Hungary and the succession states. His catalogue of works dealing with Hungary, embracing incunabula as well as more recent works, accompanied by critical comment, holds a special position in bibliographical literature. There are now offered at subscription, vols. III. and IV., edited by L. Dézsi under the title *Hungarica; Ungarn betreffende, im Ausland gedruckte Bücher und Zeitschriften* (Munich, Rosenthal; Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1927, pp. viii, 413; x, 443), covering Count Apponyi's labors in this field from the conclusion of vols. I. and II. (1900-1902) to his death in 1925. These two earlier volumes, long since out of print, will be reprinted if subscriptions warrant.

In 1665-1669 Robert Vantelet, known as Father Robert de Dreux, accompanied as almoner his relative M. de la Haye-Vantelet when the latter was sent by Louis XIV. as ambassador to the Sublime Porte. Under the auspices of the Institut Néo-Hellénique of the University of Paris, M. Hubert Pernot has published with introduction and notes the account of his travels which the almoner composed after his return to France, *Voyage en Turquie et en Grèce du R. P. Robert de Dreux, Aumônier de l'Ambassadeur de France, 1665-1669* (Paris, "Les Belles Lettres", pp. xi, 200).

*Trente Ans à la Cour de Bulgarie*, by Mme. Sultane Pétroff, traces the political and diplomatic life of that country from the commencement of Ferdinand's reign to the Peace of Neuilly (Paris, Berger, 1927, pp. 284).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: William Miller, *Notes on Frankish Greek History* (Byzantinische Zeitschrift, XXVI. 1-2); R. Rosetti, *Stephen the Great of Moldavia and the Turkish Rebellion* (Slavonic Review, June); R. J. Kerner, *The Mission of Liman von Sanders* (ibid.); Egon Gottschalk, *Rumänien und der Dreibund bis zur Krise 1914* (Die

Kriegsschuldfrage, July); Prince Nicolas of Greece, *La Grèce pendant la Grande Guerre* (Revue de Paris, July 15).

#### ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

Professor DeLacy O'Leary of the University of Bristol publishes this autumn a study of *Arabia before Muhammad* (London, Kegan Paul).

Promising great usefulness to Orientalists is E. de Zambaur's *Manuel de Généalogie et de Chronologie pour l'Histoire de l'Islam* (Hannover, Lafaire, 1927, pp. xii, 388).

A new addition to those volumes of the series *History of Civilization* (London, Kegan Paul; New York, Knopf) which are not taken over from M. Berr's *Évolution de l'Humanité* is *The Life of Buddha, as Legend and History*, by Dr. Edward J. Thomas.

Vol. XIII. of *The English Factories in India* (Oxford University Press), edited by Sir William Foster, brings the series in its present form to a close. Hereafter separate volumes will be issued for each of the three presidencies of Madras, Bombay, and Bengal.

In a Raleigh Lecture delivered before the British Academy and published for it by Humphrey Milford, under the title *The Great Game in Asia, 1800-1844*, Professor H. W. C. Davies tells the story of those adventurous servants of the crown and of the East India Company who explored and negotiated and intrigued to guard British India from Russian advances through Persia and Afghanistan.

The late sinologue J. J. M. de Groot published in 1921, shortly before his death, a work entitled *Die Hunnen der Vorchristlichen Zeit*. From his papers, and through the help of the Prussian Academy, a continuation has been compiled, *Die Westlande Chinas in der Vorchristlichen Zeit* (Berlin, de Gruyter, 1926, pp. 233). The two are published together as *Chinesische Urkunden zur Geschichte Asiens*.

Unusual interest attaches to the book *Von Gingsis Khan zur Sowjetrepublik; eine Kurze Geschichte der Mongolier mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Neuesten Zeit*, by J. J. Korostovetz (Berlin, de Gruyter, 1926, pp. xii, 351). The author was Russian envoy extraordinary in Peking after 1907, lived for months at Urga in constant relations with the Mongolian princes in 1912-1913, and has based his subsequent narrative on official Russian sources.

The *Histoire du Monde* of E. Cavaignac has received two notable additions in *La Chine Antique*, by Professor H. Maspero of the Collège de France (Paris, Boccard, 1927, pp. 640), and *L'Empire Mongol*, by L. Bouvat, librarian of the Société Asiatique (*ibid.*, 1927, pp. 450), forming vols. IV. and VIII. respectively of the complete series.

S. Uyehara, *The Industry and Trade of Japan* (London, P. S. King, 1926, pp. xv, 326), is a valuable attempt to record, in statistical as well

as narrative form, the industrial and commercial development of the country since 1868, and especially since 1900.

#### AFRICA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

*L'Afrique Saharienne et Soudanaise; ce qu'en ont connu les Anciens*, by André Berthelot, gives promise of interest (Paris, Les Arts et le Livre, 1927, pp. 430).

From the Archives des Affaires Étrangères at Paris, especially from the papers of the Piedmontese Drovetti, agent of Napoleon at Cairo, Lieutenant Georges Douin of the French navy has compiled an illuminating volume of documents on *Mohamed Aly, Pacha de Caïre, 1805-1807* (Cairo, Société Royale de Géographie d'Égypte, 1926, pp. xxxii, 240).

#### AMERICA

##### GENERAL ITEMS

The Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington has received all page-proofs of vol. IV. of Dr. Burnett's *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*, and all galley-proofs of vol. III. of Professor Bassett's *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*. The manuscript of the second and third volumes of Miss Davenport's *European Treaties bearing on the History of the United States*, extending to 1715, is practically completed. Miss Elizabeth Donnan, professor in Wellesley College, has spent the summer as usual in continuation of her work on the African slave-trade. By the aid of Mr. Gunnar J. Malmin, much progress was made toward the completion of the *Guide to Materials for American History in Scandinavian Archives*.

The Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress has lately received a large collection of vocabularies and other papers relating to the Indians of Yucatan; a collection of Maryland land patents, 1657-1832; a small collection of the papers of Bushrod, Corbin, and John A. Washington; Mr. W. B. Bryan's collection of newspaper references to the District of Columbia, 1790-1878; photostats of letters from Theodosia Burr to her half-brother A. J. F. Prevost, and of the George W. McLellan collection of Lincoln letters at Brown University; the diary of Edward Bates, 1859-1866; a group of letters from governors of Confederate states, 1860-1864; and letters of Oliver Wendell Holmes to Miss Esther B. Carpenter, 1869-1891.

A committee appointed by the American Council of Learned Societies (Professor Walter F. Willcox, chairman, Max Farrand, Robert H. Fife, jr., Joseph A. Hill, J. F. Jameson) and supplied with sufficient funds for a careful investigation of the national origins, in numerical proportion, of the population of the United States, has organized its work in two divisions, one in the charge of Dr. Marcus L. Hansen, author of the suggestive article printed in our April issue, the other in that of Mr. Howard



L. Barker of the Tariff Commission, the latter chiefly occupied with the approach to the subject through the study of family names in the census of 1790 and elsewhere, the former with other historical avenues of inquiry.

Of the twelve volumes which will compose the series called *A History of American Life* (Macmillan), edited by Professors Dixon R. Fox and Arthur M. Schlesinger, four are expected to appear in the present month of October, namely: vol. II., *The First Americans, 1607-1689*, by Professor Thomas J. Wertenbaker of Princeton University; vol. III., *Provincial Society, 1690-1763*, by Dr. James Truslow Adams; vol. VI., *The Rise of the Common Man, 1830-1849*, by Professor Carl Russell Fish of the University of Wisconsin; and vol. VIII., *The Emergence of Modern America, 1866-1878*, by Professor Allan Nevins of Cornell University.

The *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society at the meeting of October, 1926, contains an entertaining paper by Professor Wilfred H. Munro entitled "Among the Mormons in the Days of Brigham Young", but the largest element in the volume (pp. 123) is an important collection of letters, for the most part hitherto unprinted, from the Revolutionary correspondence of Governor Nicholas Cooke of Rhode Island, 1775-1781.

The Yale University Press has brought out *Builders of the Republic*, by Professor Frederic A. Ogg. The work constitutes vol. VIII. of the series *Pageant of America*.

The Oxford University Press will publish this autumn a *History of the United States*, in two volumes, by Professor Samuel E. Morison of Harvard University.

We understand that the first fascicle of the long-awaited continuation of Sabin's *Dictionary of Americana*, produced under the editorial care of Mr. Wilberforce Eames, has been published, and that the work, which in 1892 halted in "Smi", has by this additional part been carried through the entries for John Smith.

In the April number of the *Journal of Negro History* there appears an article by L. E. Murphy on the Civil Rights Law of 1875; but much the greatest part (200 pp.) of this number and that of July (166 pp. more) is occupied with the correspondence, 1839-1861, of Lewis Tappan, Joshua Leavitt, and other Americans, with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, drawn from the archives of that society by Professors Anne H. Abel and F. J. Klingberg, and presented with elaborate comment by them. The documents printed in text and foot-notes (the latter exceeding the former in amount) illustrate in the amplest manner the history of British efforts to help America to solve its problem of slavery. The July number also has an article by L. P. Jackson on the Free Negroes of Petersburg, Va.

## ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

In the Cuban *Boletín del Archivo Nacional*, XXV., the chief matter is a collection of documents of 1796 and 1877 respecting the burial and remains of Christopher Columbus, preserved in the family of Don Sebastián González de la Fuente, whom in the latter year the captain general of Cuba appointed commissioner to investigate the matter. There are a hundred pages of these.

The July *Bulletin* of the Business Historical Society contains an article on the First Iron Works in the Colonies.

The *Short History of the United States Navy*, by Rear-Admiral George R. Clark and others, has been revised and continued by Carroll S. Alden (Lippincott).

The June number of the *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library prints a fragment of lost minutes of the board of deputy postmasters general, Nov. 24, 1774, relating to the postal service in British North America. The document was recently acquired by the library. The July *Bulletin* contains a calendar of the messages and proclamations of Governor George Clinton.

Professor Louis M. Sears of Purdue University puts forth *A History of American Foreign Relations* (New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, pp. 650).

Professor William K. Woolery of Bethany College presents in the Johns Hopkins University Studies, XLV. 2, a monograph on *The Relation of Thomas Jefferson to American Foreign Policy, 1783-1793*.

In 1830 Jeremy Bentham, greatly struck by the Benthamite complexion of certain passages in President Jackson's first message to Congress (though most likely they came from the brain of Edward Livingston rather than of Jackson), wrote to the latter a long letter and sent him a long manuscript which he entitled *Anti-Senatica*, an argument against the constitution and privileges of the United States Senate. Mr. C. W. Everett has printed this, from the manuscript in the library of University College, London, in *Smith College Studies in History*, XI. 4, with an introduction.

James C. Coggins of Whittier, N. C., has brought out a revised edition of his *Abraham Lincoln a North Carolinian: with Proof*.

In 1923 Mr. John D. Rockefeller, jr., presented to the library of Brown University the collection of autographs of Abraham Lincoln made by G. W. McLellan. In 1926 there was added a collection of the manuscripts of 485 of Lincoln's war-time telegrams. The librarian of the university, Professor Harry L. Koopman, now prints such of these as are unpublished, in a handsome volume of 72 pages, *Lincoln Letters hitherto Unpublished* (University Library), with an interesting portrait of 1863, reproduced from the original photographic negative in the col-

lection. The letters and notes and telegrams add many interesting touches to the record of the man.

In a handsome illustrated volume entitled *Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and Second Inaugural* (Houghton Mifflin) Dr. Charles Moore, chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, has brought together facsimile reproductions of the first draft of the first of these famous documents, the four other autograph versions, and the three contemporary stenographic reports, and of the endorsement, manuscript, and printer's proofs of the Second Inaugural—all illuminated by authoritative historical discussion and comment.

*Fifty Golden Years: the First Half Century of the Woman's American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1877-1927*, by Bertha G. Judd, is published by the society (276 Fifth Avenue, New York).

*In Our Times* is no. 5 of the *Source-Readers in American History*, edited by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart and others (Macmillan).

*Selected Literary and Political Papers and Addresses of Woodrow Wilson*, in three volumes (New York, Grosset and Dunlap, \$2.00), is issued primarily to aid those who plan to compete in the Woodrow Wilson \$50,000 Prize Essay contest.

Louis W. Miles is the author of a *History of the 308th Infantry, 1917-1919* (Putnam). The famous "Lost Battalion" was a part of this regiment.

*Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. XXI. (pp. xxxvii, 529), contains biographies, and in most cases bibliographies, of fourteen eminent American men of science who died in the years 1918-1923.

#### LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

##### NEW ENGLAND

The Duke University Press expects to publish this autumn a study of *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution*, by Alice M. Baldwin.

Professor Evarts B. Greene has brought out through the Houghton Mifflin Company a life of his father, with the title *A New Englander in Japan: Daniel Crosby Greene*.

*The History of Bowdoin College*, by Louis C. Hatch, is published in Portland, Me., by Loring, Short, and Harmon.

Messrs. Scribner have brought out *The Birthplace of Vermont: a History of Windsor to 1781*, by Henry S. Wardner.

The April fascicle of the Massachusetts Historical Society's *Proceedings* contains a paper by Col. Edgar J. Banks on the Officers and Crew of the *Mayflower* and one by Admiral Francis T. Bowles on America's

Debt to Grasse. Dr. Worthington C. Ford contributes some interesting pages concerning Charles Sumner's correspondence with Governor Andrew in January and February, 1861, discussing particularly the alterations which Sumner made in editing his own letters. The article includes a letter from Sumner to Andrews, one from Andrews to him, and one from Charles Francis Adams, jr., to Andrews. Dr. Ford contributes also, with appropriate introduction, a list of French edicts on America, 1629-1789. In the section of documents is a letter from George Bancroft to Henry Cabot Lodge in December, 1884, together with Lodge's reply. The letters chiefly relate to the authorship of the *Federalist*.

The *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, July number, continues its list of Massachusetts prisoners of 1812-1815 detained at Quebec, and Mrs. Ethel Stanwood Bolton's list of immigrants to New England, 1700-1775.

The *Annual Report* of the Connecticut Historical Society for 1927 contains an extended account of the founding and growth of the society and of its connection with the Wadsworth Atheneum and the Watkinson Library of Reference, with which two institutions it is so closely associated.

#### MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The *History of the City of Ogdensburg*, by the Right Rev. P. S. Garand, its bishop (Ogdensburg, Rev. M. J. Belleville), relates the life of Father Picquet and his Indians, the part taken by Ogdensburg men in wars of the United States, the Canadian rebellion of 1837, and Fenian raids, etc.

The July issue of the *Proceedings* of the New Jersey Historical Society includes an article on the Meaning of Middlebrook, by Willis F. Johnson; one by Rev. Oscar M. Voorhees on Bernards Township in the Revolution; some extracts from the diary of Seth Boyden recording the events of a journey to California and life there (1849-1851); and some sketches of Jersey People famed elsewhere, one of them being Peter Force.

In the July number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* Philip R. Dillon discourses upon the Strange Case of Admiral de Grasse; William O. Sawtelle contributes the first installment of a paper on Acadia, the Pre-Loyalist Migration and the Philadelphia Plantation; and Frances Baxter continues the account of Rafting on the Alleghany and Ohio, 1844.

The Wyoming Historical and Geological Society of Wilkes-Barré, Pa., has decided to publish the valuable manuscript material which has recently come into its possession relating to the early settlement of the Wyoming Valley in the colonial era under the auspices of the Susquehanna Company. These "Susquehanna Papers", to be edited by Pro-

fessor W. F. Dunaway of the Pennsylvania State College, are of great interest and importance and will throw a flood of light upon the occupation of the region around Wilkes-Barré by a group of Connecticut settlers in the decade preceding the Revolution. The chance discovery of a collection of 150 manuscripts on the Susquehanna settlements, held by a family in Kansas City whose ancestors had come from Connecticut, leads the society to solicit the co-operation of individuals and organizations in notifying them of any other manuscripts of the sort.

The *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* has in the July number a biographical sketch of Colonel John Armstrong (1717-1795), by J. W. King; an account of Hugh H. Brackenridge at Princeton, 1768-1771, by Martha Conner; and a sketch of Brackenridge as a lawyer, by Myrl I. Eakin. There is also a letter of James L. Bowman, written in 1845, relating to pioneer conditions in Western Pennsylvania.

*Early Narratives of Berks County, Pa.*, by J. Bennett Nolan, is published in Reading by the author (36 North Sixth Street).

#### SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The *Maryland Historical Magazine* has, in the June number, a contribution by Louis D. Scisco on the Colonial Records of Talbot County, and one by Arthur L. Keith on the Smallwood Family of Charles County. *The Life of Thomas Johnson*, member of the Continental Congress, first governor of the state of Maryland, and associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, by Edward S. Delaplaine, which has appeared serially in that journal, has now been published as a volume (New York, F. H. Hitchcock).

The July number of the *Virginia Magazine of History* begins a series of Letters of the Byrd Family, the present installment however consisting mostly of documents, mainly of the year 1704. The life of Chapman Johnson (d. 1849) is concluded. Further documents on Jacob Stauber's colony are contributed, and there are continuations of other series, such as the Council Journals.

*The William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* has in the July number the second installment of the paper by S. M. Pargellis on Procedure of the Virginia House of Burgesses, continuations of the Letters of Edward Coles and Documents of Sir Francis Wyatt, and a letter from Mann Page, May 26, 1777, at that time a member of the Continental Congress.

The July number of *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* contains an article by Paul S. Whitcomb on Lincoln and Democracy; one by Capt. S. A. Ashe on the Battle of Shallow Ford; the will of Augustine Washington, sr. (father of George Washington), contributed, with an introduction, by C. A. Hoppin; some letters of Jefferson (1826) respecting the University of Virginia; and, under the heading

Virginia Heroes of the War of 1812 and Mexican War, some materials respecting the services of Maj.-Gen. M. S. Jessup and Gen. John G. Camp.

Dr. Philip Alexander Bruce has brought out through the J. P. Bell Company of Lynchburg, Va., a revised and enlarged edition of his *Social Life in Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*.

Rev. Edward L. Goodwin is the author of a volume entitled *The Colonial Church in Virginia, with Biographical Sketches of the First Six Bishops of Virginia, and other Historical Papers* (Milwaukee, Morehouse).

The North Carolina Historical Commission has lately received some 600 pages of transcripts and photostats of documents in the London Public Record Office relating to North Carolina Loyalists. This completes their records on this subject. Six volumes and about ten thousand pieces of North Carolina county records have also been received.

The July number of the *North Carolina Historical Review* contains an article by Theodore H. Jack on the Preservation of Georgia History; one by A. P. Whitaker on Spain and the Cherokee Indians, 1783-1798; one by E. H. Ketcham on the Direct Tax Clause of the Federal Constitution; and some letters of Luther R. Mills, a Confederate soldier. There are also several reprints of newspaper items.

The principal matter in the July number of the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* is the beginning of a serial and extensive printing of the correspondence of Henry Laurens, one of the chief treasures of the South Carolina Historical Society. The letters are to be annotated by Mr. Joseph W. Barnwell. Of this invaluable series the first installment contains letters of the period 1747 to 1764.

*The South Carolina Constitution of 1895*, by Professor David D. Wallace, has been published as a *Bulletin* (no. 197) of the University of South Carolina.

Articles in the June number of the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* are: the Early Industrial Revolution in the Empire State, by R. H. Shryock; the American Colonies on the Preliminaries of the War of Jenkins' Ear, by John T. Lanning; the Reverend Samuel Quincy, S. P. G. Missionary, by Edgar L. Pennington; Abraham Baldwin, Statesman and Educator, by R. P. Brooks; and a sketch of Edward Langworthy, by Burton A. Konkle, together with a letter from Langworthy to William Duer, December 8 [18?], 1778, pertaining chiefly to proceedings of the Continental Congress. There are also some documents relating to aspects of slavery.

F. H. Hitchcock of New York has brought out *Annals of Georgia: being the Early Liberty County Records, Liberty County Connections in South Carolina, and a State Revolutionary Payroll*, by Carrie P. Wilson.

The July number of the *Florida Historical Society Quarterly* contains

an address by Dr. James A. Robertson entitled the Significance of Florida's History; an article on Ante-Bellum Census Enumerations, by Roland M. Harper; some Notes on the Origin of the Seminole Indians of Florida, by Frank Drew; part II. of the paper on St. Joseph, by James O. Knauss; extracts from some official British correspondence in 1783, contributed by Carita D. Corse, with remarks upon Florida History as a Field of Colorful Resources; and a fascicle, with translation, of Governor Copping's proclamation, July 7, 1821.

The October, 1926, number of the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* contains the usual installment of council records of the French period and judicial records of the Spanish, and a very interesting inventory of all the contents and appliances of an indigo plantation in 1773. But the main portion of the contents is a careful monograph of a hundred pages on the Elections of 1859 and 1860 in Louisiana, a "master's thesis" by Miss Mary L. McLure. The January, 1927, number gives a group of documents concerning Bienville's lands in Louisiana, 1719-1737, the beginning of a series of such printings from a volume of transcripts called the "Book of Concessions," possessed by the Louisiana Historical Society. It also has an extensive account, put together by J. F. Hardin, of Captain Henry M. Shreve, founder of Shreveport, whose reports on the removal of the Red River Raft in the 'thirties have been obtained from Washington archives; and an account of the Notarial System of Louisiana, by Edgar Griema.

#### WESTERN STATES

The September number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* opens with Dr. Otto L. Schmidt's address delivered last April as president of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, on the Mississippi Valley in 1816 through an Englishman's Diary, namely, the diary, possessed by the Chicago Historical Society, of George Flower, founder of Albion, Ill. There is also an address by M. André Lafargue, on the French Governors of Louisiana, an excellent description of the Routine on a Louisiana Sugar Plantation under the Slavery Régime, about 1850, by Professor Walter Prichard of the Louisiana State University, and a statistical article estimating the Economic Incidence of the Civil War in the South, by James L. Sellers of Wisconsin. The document is Sergeant Hugh Evans's journal of Colonel Henry Dodge's expedition of the U. S. Dragoons up the Platte and its South Fork to the Rocky Mountains in 1835, edited by Fred S. Perrine; and there is a full and interesting account of the twentieth annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, by Bruce E. Mahan of Iowa.

The June number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* contains, besides the continuation of Allen Wiley's studies of Methodism in Southeastern Indiana, a sketch of Judge Elisha M. Huntington, by Thomas J. de la Hunt; an article on Indian History of Bartholomew County, by George Pence; and one on Pierre Moran, or Chief Parish of the Pottawattomie Indians, by John W. Whicker.



The *Indiana History Bulletin* for May (extra number 3) is an account, by J. Arthur MacLean, of the Excavation of Albee Mound in 1926. The monograph, which is extensively illustrated, includes a catalogue of the finds, a bibliography of Indiana archaeology, etc.

Among the articles in the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, issue for October, 1926-January, 1927 (double number), are a discourse by Professor James A. James on the Significance of the Sesqui-Centennial Celebration of the American Revolution West of the Alleghany Mountains; an appreciation of the late Mrs. Jessie Palmer Weber, by Professor Evarts B. Greene; a descriptive account of Six Months in the White House (with the Lincolns), by Mrs. Elizabeth Todd Grimsley; an address on Abraham Lincoln and New Salem, by Rev. William E. Barton; Lincoln and the American Tradition of Civil Liberty, by Professor Arthur C. Cole; Indians and Indian Fighters, by Cornelius J. Doyle; Sangamo Town, by John L. Roll; and a History of the Morgan County Bar, by Cyrus Epler.

A *History of Illinois and her People*, in six volumes, by George W. Smith, has been put forth by the American Historical Society of Chicago, a publishing concern in no wise to be confused with the American Historical Association.

The *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* for July continues Dr. J. J. Thompson's papers on La Salle, and prints an address by Rev. Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J., on the Purpose of a Catholic Historical Society (read on occasion of the founding of the Catholic Historical Society of Indiana, last October), one by John P. McGoorty on the Early Irish in Illinois, and an interesting sketch, found among the unpublished papers of Father Francis Xavier Kuppens, S.J. (1838-1916), of Christmas Day, 1865, in Virginia City, Montana.

Douglas C. McMurtrie has prepared a volume entitled *The First Printers of Chicago, with a Bibliography of the Issues of the Chicago Press, 1836-1850* (Chicago, P. Covici).

*Trends of Population in the Region of Chicago*, by Helen R. Jeter, is published by the University of Chicago Press.

Articles in the July number of the (Louisville) *History Quarterly* are: the Philosophical Reformers of the Eighteenth Century, by L. R. Gottschalk; Mann's Lick, by Marguerite Threlkel; the Harpes, two Outlaws of Pioneer Times, by Otto A. Rothert; and Colonel Cuthbert Bullitt's Personal Recollections of General George Rogers Clark, by Captain Alfred Pirtle.

Articles in the *Tennessee Historical Magazine* for July, 1925 (issued in May, 1927) are: General Robert E. Lee after Appomattox, by Hunter McDonald; Colonel Joseph Williams's Battalion in Christian's Campaign (1776), being Colonel Williams's own account of the campaign, with an

introduction and notes by Judge Samuel C. Williams; and the third installment of Erik M. Eriksson's paper on Official Newspaper Organs and the Presidential Election of 1836.

In the July number of the *Michigan History Magazine* Carl E. Pray discourses upon an Historic Michigan Road, Marion M. Davis upon a Romantic Chain of Islands, and Meredith P. Sawyer gives some account of the Michigan-Wisconsin Boundary Dispute, a dispute brought to a conclusion only in November last by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States; while Ira H. Butterfield, jr., contributes, with some comment, his record of a journey to California in 1861; Edward G. Holden offers as one of the Little Journeys in Journalism a glimpse of the history of the *Detroit Free Press*, and Judge William R. Riddell, using the title Taxation without Representation: an Echo of July 4, 1776, relates, on the basis of a recently discovered document, how, about 1795, the same principle was invoked in Detroit but with an opposite purpose.

The University of Detroit has published *The Germanic Influence in the Making of Michigan*, by John A. Russell.

The Wisconsin legislature of 1927 made a special additional grant of \$5000 per annum to the State Historical Society, a portion of which is to be used for the preparation, by Dr. Joseph Schafer, superintendent of the society, of a monograph on *Carl Schurz in Wisconsin*, intended to be finished in time for the centenary of Schurz in March, 1929. Another portion of the new appropriation will be used in printing vol. IV. of the Constitution Series. The society plans also to publish before long vol. III. of its Calendar Series, a Calendar of the Tennessee and King's Mountain Papers in the Draper Collection.

The *Wisconsin Magazine of History* has in the June number an article by William F. Whyte on the Bennett Law Campaign (the campaign around 1890 over the law restricting the use of foreign languages in schools), with a discussion of the article by Dr. Schafer. There is also an article by James A. Wilgus on the Century-Old Lead Region; and some Personal Recollections of Governor Dewey are contributed by Victor Kitchin. The section of documents includes an account by Rev. Louis von Ragué of his experiences in Sheboygan County, translated.

The Minnesota Historical Society has recently made extensive additions to its photostatic copies of the American Fur Company Papers in the possession of the New York Historical Society, including statistical data on the trade from the ledgers and other account books in that collection. Other accessions include transcripts of the diaries kept, 1849-1854, by Alexander Ramsey, first governor of Minnesota Territory; a photostatic copy of David Thompson's "log" or itinerary of his trip through northern Minnesota in 1798; photostatic copies of material in the Nicollet Papers in the Library of Congress bearing on explorations in the Upper

Mississippi country in the 'thirties; a diary kept by John N. Simpson on a trip through Virginia in 1799; a file of the *Emigrant Aid Journal of Minnesota*, founded by Ignatius Donnelly and Philip Rohr and published at Nininger, now a "lost town", in 1856 and 1857; photostatic copies of the extensive records in the Senate Files at Washington of the military commission that tried nearly four hundred Indians after the Sioux Outbreak of 1862; and the Edward A. Bromley Collection of several thousand negatives and pictures of early scenes and pioneers of Minnesota and the Northwest.

The September number of *Minnesota History* contains an article by Professor August C. Krey on Monte Cassino, Metten, and Minnesota, which sketches the background and career of the Benedictine Monastery of St. John at Collegeville; one by Miss Louise Phelps Kellogg on Fort Beauharnois, the French post established on the west shore of Lake Pepin in 1727; one by Miss Grace Lee Nute entitled *Wilderness Marthas*, dealing with the experiences of three wives of missionaries to the Indians in Minnesota during the 'thirties and 'forties; and an account of the State Historical Convention at St. Cloud and Willmar on June 16 and 17.

A biography of Leonard F. Parker, for many years professor of history in the State University of Iowa and in Grinnell College, has recently been completed by J. A. Swisher, research associate in the State Historical Society of Iowa. This biography will soon be published in the *Iowa Biographical Series*. Bruce E. Mahan, associate editor for the Society, has begun the compilation of a history of the Iowa State Council of National Defense, as a part of the *Iowa Chronicles of the World War Series*.

The July number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* contains a biographical account, by Ruth A. Gallaher, of Samuel R. Curtis (1807-1866), a study of the Election of 1892 in Iowa, by Walter E. Nydegger, and an article on Wild Life in Early Iowa, by Henry A. Bennett.

The contents of the July number of the *Annals of Iowa* include: Wabaunsee, the Indian Chief (a Fragment), being notes "historical and legendary", collected and prepared by the late Seth Dean; Indian Affairs of the Iowa Region, 1827-1830, a group of documents; Pioneer Water Power Mills of Dallas County, by Frank Hoeye; and Iowa Territory and General Jackson's Fine, by David C. Mott.

The June number of the *Palimpsest* is occupied with a discussion, by Charles R. Keyes, of Prehistoric Man in Iowa; the July number has an article by F. R. Aumann entitled a Minor Prophet in Iowa, being an account of the activities of one Charles B. Thompson in the years 1853-1858; and the August number contains an adaptation of J. N. Nicollet's report of his explorations of the basin of the upper Mississippi River between 1838 and 1840.

The contents of the *Missouri Historical Review* include an article on Missouri and Imperialism, by Caspar S. Yost; one on David Todd, by North Todd Gentry; one on the Development of Local History, by Edgar White; one on the Missouri Priest One Hundred Years Ago, by Rev. John E. Rothensteiner; and the third chapter of Raymond D. Thomas's *Study in Missouri Politics, 1840-1870*.

*Bulletin 82* of the Bureau of American Ethnology is *Archaeological Observations North of the Rio Colorado*, by Neil M. Judd. The area of reconnaissance extends from the Grand Cañon in Arizona to the northern shore of Great Salt Lake, in Utah, and the investigations were conducted in the years 1915-1920. At one stage in them the author was inclined to believe that he had "followed the course of tribal migrations and witnessed the result of aboriginal community development"; but in the end he was convinced that the evidence was too inconclusive and that more detailed investigation would be necessary. He has, however, no hesitation in declaring the culture to have been what is called Puebloan.

The *New Mexico Historical Review* has in the July number an article by Edward D. Tittmann on the Last Legal Frontier; one by Lansing B. Bloom on Early Weaving in New Mexico; an installment of the Gallegos Relation of the expedition made by Father Augustin Rodríguez and Captain Francisco Sánchez Chamuscado to New Mexico, 1581-1582, with introduction and notes by George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey; and a continuation of Fred S. Perrine's account of Military Escorts on the Santa Fé Trail.

The contents of the July number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* include a paper by Robert G. Raymer on Educational Development in the Territory and State of Washington, 1853-1908; one by R. L. Reid on the Whatcom Trails to the Fraser River Mines in 1858 (to be continued); some letters of General B. L. E. Bonneville relating to his expedition into the Oregon country, contributed by Mrs. Anne H. Abel-Henderson; and an Official Eulogy of Bonneville, procured by Rev. J. Neilson Barry.

Professor Samuel E. Morison contributes to the June number of the *Oregon Historical Quarterly* a paper on New England and the Opening of the Columbia River Salmon Trade, 1830; C. S. Kingston one on the Western Sea in the *Jesuit Relations*; Rev. J. Neilson Barry one on the Indians in Washington, their Distribution by Languages; and Lewis A. McArthur the seventh of his studies of Oregon Geographic Names.

The Stanford University Press has brought out (*History, Economics, and Political Science*, vol. II., no 1) *The Political Career of Stephen Mallory White: a Study of Party Activities under the Convention System*, by Edith Dobie.

*The Presbyterian Church in California, 1849-1927*, by Rev. Edward A. Wicher, is published in New York by F. H. Hitchcock.

## CANADA

The June number of the *Canadian Historical Review*, after an account of the annual meeting held by the Canadian Historical Association at Toronto, May 27 and 28, presents a valuable historical survey of the curricula of the faculty of arts in the universities and colleges of Canada by Sir Robert Falconer, The Tradition of Liberal Education in Canada; and an interesting article on Music in New France in the Seventeenth Century, based chiefly on the Jesuit *Relations*, by Miss Lota Spell of Texas. The proceedings of Sir George Calvert against Sir David Kirke in respect to Calvert's grant in Newfoundland are illustrated by documents extracted by L. D. Scisco from the Calvert papers at Baltimore.

Father Candide de Nant has furnished under the title *Pages Glorieuses de l'Épopée Canadienne; une Mission Capucine en Acadie* (Paris, Maisonneuve, 1927, pp. xv, 338) a history of Acadia (1632-1655), illustrated with early maps and plans. The work is based on archival studies from the Vatican to Massachusetts, as well as on the records of the Capuchins, the Jesuits, and many other sources.

## AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

The *Hispanic American Historical Review* for August opens with an exposition from the Miranda Papers, lately transferred from the possession of Lord Bathurst to that of Venezuela, of Miranda's Testamentary Dispositions, by Professor W. S. Robertson. This is followed by a paper on the Development of the Intervention in Haiti, by Professor C. E. Chapman, and one on the risk involved in the issue of the Monroe Doctrine, by W. F. Craven, jr. The number also contains two interesting surveys of work in the United States on Latin-American history: one on its teaching in colleges, normal schools, and universities, by a committee appointed by the American Historical Association, W. S. Robertson, chairman, the other a survey of investigations in progress or contemplated, prepared with much industry by Professor A. C. Wilgus.

The University of North Carolina Press puts forth, as vol. XIX., no. 2, of the *James Sprunt Historical Studies*, a group of *Studies in Hispanic-American History*, edited by Professor W. W. Pierson—four studies in number. In the first, Dr. James A. Robertson presents notes on the Transfer by Spain of Plants and Animals to its Colonies Overseas; in the second, Professor J. F. Rippy discourses on the European Powers (actually, Germany) and the Spanish-American War, on the basis of vol. XV. of *Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette*; in the third, Mrs. Guion G. Johnson writes on the Monroe Doctrine and the Panama Congress; the fourth, by Professor Pierson, concerns the establishment and early functioning of the Intendencia of Cuba, instituted in 1764.

The April number of the *University of Missouri Studies* is a monograph on the Life and Works of Manuel Gutiérrez Nájera (1859-1895), Mexican poet and journalist, by Nell Walker.

The celebrated Mexican bibliographer Don Joaquín García Icazbalceta prepared and left in manuscript a catalogue of the remarkable collection of historical manuscripts which he had formed. This the Mexican ministry of Foreign Affairs has printed as no. 9 of its series of *Monografías Bibliográficas Mexicanas*, in the first 87 pages of a *Catálogo de la Colección de Manuscritos de Joaquín García Icazbalceta relativos a la Historia de América* (pp. 289); the remainder of the volume is occupied by learned notes on the manuscripts by Senor Federico Gómez de Orozco, and a few texts of documents, the whole forming a valuable contribution to the knowledge of the sources of Mexican history.

Fray Froilan de Rionegro, Capuchin, has derived from the papers of the Council of the Indies in various Spanish archives the materials for a series of volumes of *Actuaciones y Documentos* of the Spanish government relating to the provinces now forming Venezuela. The first of these volumes, published by the Venezuelan government but printed in Spain (Coruña, tip. *El Ideal Gallego*, 1926, pp. 389, 89), consists of 389 pages of introduction, treating the history of Venezuela to 1600 in the unusual form of "conversations", after which a commencement is made of documentation by printing 36 pages of documents, beginning with a description of Caracas in 1572 and several papers of the Losada family.

Señor C. Medina Chirinos announces the intention of publishing a work on Francisco de Miranda, based on documents obtained from the Archivo General de Indias at Seville. Meantime the three commissioners appointed by President Gómez to deal editorially with the papers of Miranda lately acquired by his government from Lord Bathurst have brought out in a volume the series of indexes prefixed to each volume of this great manuscript collection, *Indice del Archivo del General Miranda* (Caracas, 1927, pp. xii, 110).

Senhor Alberto de Faria, Brazilian ambassador to Japan, in his *Vida do Visconde de Mauá* (1813-1889), a biography of a captain of industry to whom Brazil is indebted for its first railways into the interior, its first line of navigation on the Amazon, and many other industrial improvements, illustrates both the political and the social and economic history of Brazil.

An episode of some importance in the relations of the two Americas is treated by Señor Carlos Correa Luna in *Alvear y la Diplomacia de 1824-1825, en Inglaterra, Estados Unidos, y Alta Perú, con Canning, Monroe, Quincy Adams, Bolívar, y Sucre* (Buenos Aires, 1926, pp. xiv, 111).

The University of Iowa is bringing out the *Documentary History of the Tacna-Arica Dispute*, which will appear as vol. VIII., no. 3, of the *University of Iowa Studies*.

The Archivo General of Argentina, Señor Augusto S. Mallié director, has published vol. II. of series III. and vol. II. of series IV. of *Acuerdos*

del extinguido Cabildo de Buenos Aires (pp. 727, 849), conveying respectively the records of the years 1756-1761 and 1805-1807.

The Yale University Press has published *The Struggle for the Falkland Islands: a Study in Legal and Diplomatic History*, by Professor Julius L. Goebel, of Columbia University.

---

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Leturia, *El Origen Histórico del Patronato de Indias* (Razon y Fe, LXXVIII., 1); Marguerite M. McKee, *Service of Supply in the War of 1812*, III., IV. (Quartermaster Review, May-June, July-August); George T. Lee, *Reminiscences of General Robert E. Lee* (South Atlantic Quarterly, July); A. Nerinx, *L'Arbitrage Anglo-Américain de 1925 à Washington* (Académie Royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres, XII. 10); J. Tramond, *Saint-Domingue en 1756 et 1757, d'après la Correspondance de l'Ordonnateur Lambert* (Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises, XV. 2); Paul H. Douglas, *The American Occupation of Haiti* (Political Science Quarterly, June); Hellmuth von Cramon, *Der Diplomatische Kampf Englands und der Vereinigten Staaten um Nicaragua* (Europäische Gespräche, June); Ricardo Levene, *L'Interprétation Économique de l'Histoire Argentine* (Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español, III.).



### CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

Dr. Marcus W. Jernegan is a professor of history in the University of Chicago.

Dr. George H. Guttridge is an assistant professor of history in the University of California.

Dr. Edward M. Earle is an associate professor of history in Columbia University.

Dr. Thomas P. Abernethy is a professor of history in the University of Chattanooga.

Dr. Duncan B. Macdonald is a professor in Hartford Theological Seminary.

Dr. Arthur L. Cross is a professor of history in the University of Michigan.

Dr. William A. Robinson is a professor of political science in Dartmouth College.

Dr. Robert E. Riegel is a professor of economics in Dartmouth College.